

Spearhead

£1.50

No. 435

MAY 2005

ISSN 1364-7105

General Election 2005

A FRAUD AND A FARCE

On the right are the dismal choices of prime minister if the British people vote for any of the mainstream parties. All of them are committed to rule by Europe, multi-racialism, soft policies on crime and further ruin of British industry by the global economy. Unless you have a BNP candidate standing in your area, it's a waste of time voting!

OUR COMMENT ON PAGE TWO



WHAT WE THINK

A fraud and a farce

As the racket of 'democracy' degenerates ever further, parliamentary and other elections take on more and more the elements of fraud and farce. The British general election, due to be held on the 5th of this month, is no different. Media reports have highlighted the dangers of fraudulent practice likely to occur through the abuse of the postal voting system, but that will be only the tip of the iceberg. The entire proceedings are being conducted in an atmosphere of such dishonesty that, whichever party wins, the verdict will have very little to do with the actual will of the people that is supposed to be the keystone of democratic politics; nor will it have the smallest effect on the way in which the country is governed thereafter.

This has never been better exhibited – at least by mainstream journalists – than in an article titled 'The phoney election', written by Peter Osborne and appearing in the *Daily Mail* on 23rd April. Mr. Osborne, though by no means any kind of foaming 'far-right' radical, illustrated admirably the forces that

Nationalist comment

have taken over our political system and perverted it to their own purposes.

He began by describing a TV walkabout by Tony Blair in Rushden, Northamptonshire, where the Premier was shown shaking hands and talking with what the viewers were supposed to think were ordinary local people. Smiles, nods and friendly reactions from everyone were on display. However, said Osborne, this was not a gathering of the local public but...

"The point is that every person there I spoke to was a Labour Party member – there is no doubt that these 'ordinary' voters were handpicked.

"Party officials tried to stop me getting in. Had any other members of the public got to hear that Tony Blair was in town and tried to meet him, then they also would have been barred.

"Mr. Blair had made sure he was among friends, so there were no worries about a hostile reaction, or even an awkward question. The media presence was strictly controlled."

And Osborne continued a little further on:-

"The ancient institutions of British democracy have been captured by a new professional political élite, which no longer seeks to communicate with the voters as equals.

"Instead, it sets out to dupe, deceive and manipulate us from behind the scenes. The terrifying thing is that many ordinary voters do not even understand this is happening."

And:-

"This pitiful general election is turning into a matter for national shame. The main parties all agree about the substan-

tive issues, but pretend they do not by manufacturing artificial differences. Very often they resort to lies and deceit to distinguish themselves from rivals."

So what is Mr. Osborne saying? Only what our magazine has been saying for some forty years, though as time has passed the truth of it has been increasingly underlined as the racket has revealed itself ever more glaringly.

But perhaps the most sinister and alarming of Mr. Osborne's revelations was where he wrote of the manner in which the leading parties employ computer technology to ascertain the likely voting tendencies of electors and then target them specially with approaches geared to their perceived feelings. Let him take up the story:-

"Political parties can now use a mass of information about ordinary citizens, which most of us wrongly assume is private: our credit card details, our shopping habits, what magazines we read, what restaurants we eat at, how much we are in debt... For instance, someone who has lived in the same house for more than ten years and has very low personal indebtedness is extremely likely to vote Tory. By contrast, heavily indebted people who have recently moved house are likely to fall into the category of swing voter."

So just how does this kind of information which is supposed to be private fall into the hands of the political party chiefs? Credit card details should only be known to our banks – and possibly to the police in the rare instances of people being investigated for law-breaking. Shopping habits? What, do party snoopers follow everyone when they go shopping? Or do they get this information from debit entries on credit card account statements – in which case how? Do they tail us when we go to buy magazines or eat out? This seems ridiculous, as it would take millions of them to do so. As for indebtedness, again this is information which only banks and similar bodies should know, with the tiny few exceptions mentioned.

One can only conclude from all this that such knowledge about our private circumstances – however acquired – is passed on to some kind of state bureau and thence handed to the political parties -- needless to say, those political parties on the state's 'approved' list: it is inconceivable that it could be placed at the disposal of a party like the BNP.

We have in the past been ridiculed by people in the media as 'conspiracy nuts' but here is evidence from a writer and occasional broadcaster who enjoys a well-esteemed position in the media world admitting what cannot be otherwise described than as a conspiracy by the ruling establishment to control supposedly 'free' citizens and ensure, as far as possible, that they vote for one or another of that establishment's nom-

Spearhead

No. 435 MAY 2005
PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4GG
Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British Nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated otherwise, the views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Spearhead* are the sole responsibility of their writers and should not be taken to represent the views of the editor or of any political organisation that *Spearhead* may support editorially.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. The editor reserves the right to refuse, without giving reasons, to publish any advertisement submitted. The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* does not necessarily indicate that the editor knows anything about, is interested in or supports the product, service, organisation or function being advertised.

The editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication. The preferred length is between 1,000 and 1,800 words. The preferred method for sending such a manuscript is by computer disk. If computer facilities are not available to the writer, the manuscript should be submitted typed with the use of a typewriter of decent quality, with a ribbon which leaves the text distinctive and without smudges. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless the writer specifically requests otherwise. The editor reserves the right to shorten or in any other way amend articles submitted for publication.

Those wishing to reprint *Spearhead* items in other publications should be sure when doing so to give public acknowledgement to both the writer and *Spearhead* and to include in the acknowledgement the magazine's full address.

inally separate and 'alternative' parties which theoretically offer a 'choice' but in reality stand, as Mr. Osborne himself has acknowledged, for virtually the same things!

The immigration 'con'

We spoke about it in our March issue but since then things have moved on, and now we see both Labour and Tory locked in an utterly bogus debate on the raging issue of immigration, on evidence so far becoming the number-one issue in this election. On April 22nd Princess Tony delivered a speech, conveniently scheduled for Dover, in which he claimed to show concern for the voters' worries about immigration. In this speech Tony even went so far as to borrow, almost word for word, the language of Tory leader Michael Howard when he said: "Concern over asylum and immigration is not racism," and "It's not racist to talk about immigration." Just listen to this gem of humbug coming from the Prime Minister when speaking of the Tories:-

"Why do they say we 'pussyfoot' around on this issue when they know perfectly well we have been legislating on it from 1998 onwards, tightening the system, often in the face of their opposition?"

"It is an attempt deliberately to exploit people's fears, to suggest that, for reasons of political correctness, those in power don't dare deal with the issue, so that the public is left with the impression that they are being silenced in their concerns, that we are blindly ignoring them or telling them that to raise the issue is racist, when actually the opposite is true."

One has to pause to take a deep breath before fully taking in this quite staggering statement from Mr. Blair. 'Pussyfooting' is exactly what his Government has been doing on the immigration issue since taking power eight years ago, but so also have the Tories pussyfooted equally until quite recently, when Mr. Howard discovered the issue was a potential vote-winner. And not only that, both Labour and the Tories have been pussyfooting over the immigrant invasion since it began more than half a century ago. Let us not forget how Tory leader Edward Heath sacked his colleague Enoch Powell and hounded him into the political wilderness for daring to raise the issue as long back as 1968. Are the Tories now realising that Powell was right? If so, they should admit it honestly and openly and deliver him a posthumous apology; but of course there is no chance they will ever do so.

As for Blair's claim that New Labour has been 'legislating', they can legislate till they are blue in the face. What the British public wants to see is clear evidence of diminishing numbers of immigrants on our streets – something of which there is not the slightest sign.

Exploiting people's fears! Isn't that what democratic politics have always been about? With the body politic always divided into warring factions, what else can we ever expect than that each faction will exploit public fears over this and that in order to win some advantage over the other? As soon as one politician disagrees with another about something, he is venturing into the territory in which people's fears are likely to be exploited. Sometimes this is entirely justified. You may as well as say that someone who sets off a fire alarm is exploiting people's fear of being caught in a blazing building! The very phrase is ridiculous, infantile and dishonest; but precisely for this reason it has become the stock-in-trade of today's party politicians.

The other common feature of the present bogus immigration debate is the regular tendency of both politicians and media pundits to say that if the immigration issue is not addressed, the voters will be driven into the arms of the 'awful' BNP. But what is so awful about the BNP? It has only been saying, since its launch in 1982, what many mainstream politicians are now saying, albeit in watered down form, about the immigration danger. If ever there was a case of shooting the messenger this is it. We nationalists are pilloried and reviled for sounding warnings many years ago which are now being heeded, very belatedly, by our revilers!

There is, of course, one essential thing missing from this now open debate, and it is something we spotlighted in our leader article on the subject two months ago. All those engaged in the debate on behalf of the mainstream parties still refuse to admit that the immigration issue is, more than anything else, one about *race*. The immigrant influx is a threat to this nation precisely because nearly all the incomers belong to races and cultures that are alien to it and unassimilable within it. Both Howard and now Blair say it is not 'racist' to be concerned about immigration; but in fact any concern about immigration that excludes racial considerations is just meaningless. The immigration issue is a *racial* issue first and foremost, and approaching it from any other standpoint is just skating around the problem – in effect 'pussyfooting', as Mr. Blair seems so anxious to deny he is doing.

We should end this analysis on an upbeat note. It is a sign of some progress towards truth and common sense that immigration is now accepted as a fit topic for open national discussion. The very fact that it has become so stands to the credit of the so-called 'racists' who have campaigned on the issue for many years, not of the shameless opportunists who have very recently climbed on the bandwagon. We must now carry the debate the remainder of the way, so that before long it

will become 'mainstream' to discuss immigration as the racial issue that, primarily, it is. Then we will *really* be getting somewhere!

Contradicting themselves

As a classic example of the double-speak currently employed by the 'liberal' press on the topic of race and immigration, *The Sunday Times* of 10th April featured two items which should be studied carefully.

On page 22 there was an article about 'tolerant' Britain in which the writer, John Elliott, spoke glowingly about how easy-going the British were about their next-door neighbours. "In Britain," he said, "91 per cent are not concerned by having neighbours of a different race, compared with 68 per cent in Turkey, 83 per cent in Belgium and a world average of 84 per cent." Bully for us Brits!

But then on page 16 of the very same paper there appeared at the top of the page a report by David Leppard headed 'Immigration rise increases segregation in British cities'. The report went on to say that:-

"An increasingly mobile population means that white families are moving from Birmingham, Manchester and Bradford to be replaced by immigrants from Asia."

The report went on to cite a survey made by the London School of Economics – not exactly an 'extreme right-wing' institution – last year which found that "in inner-city areas ethnic minorities were becoming isolated because the white population was moving out."

This, of course, was just another way of acknowledging the widely recognised phenomenon of 'white flight'. So what should we believe: answers given to pollsters by householders questioned about their preference for neighbours – householders, like so many, frightened of being branded as 'racist' – or the evidence of people voting with their feet by moving away from heavily 'ethnic' areas into overwhelmingly white areas out of town?

The one hope

In the few illustrations we have had the space to provide here we should have supplied abundant evidence that the general election on May 5th will achieve precisely nothing in the way of tackling the tremendous problems now besetting Britain. The election is a sham, enacted for the purpose of deceiving the British people that they have a say in the nation's future, whereas they have absolutely none at all. The election will be decided according to who are the cleverest liars among the politicians and their supporters in broadcasting and the press.

The one beacon of light in all this thick fog is the British National Party. Let's hope it shines brightly on May 5th!

The big Tory con-trick

AN ARTICLE in the *Financial Times* on 14th April provided a revealing insight into what has become probably the number-one issue in this month's general election. Penned by Pippa Norris, it said:-

"Why has Michael Howard decided to shift the focus of the campaign towards the issue of refugees, travellers and immigration?...

"In the past a liberal consensus has been shared among the mainstream politicians in all the main parties not to 'play the race card,' because of the sensitivity and inflammatory nature of the issue. During the 2004 local elections, Mr. Howard was at pains to emphasise the distance between the Conservative Party and racist extremists on the far right. Nevertheless, immigration has emerged in the Conservative campaign, in part because discussion of the issue has been legitimised by the recent success of the radical right in Britain...

"... one reason why the far-right parties have always been marginalised in general elections is that when they have made some modest gains the Conservatives have quickly moved towards a more hardline stance on immigration, defusing their popular support...

"The Conservatives' strategy is similar to that used by many other European centre-right parties when confronted by a popular threat from their xenophobic rivals. In France, President Jacques Chirac adopted tougher talk on immigration and crime when the socialist prime minister Lionel Jospin was defeated in the presidential election by Jean-Marie Le Pen. In the subsequent elections, [Le Pen's] *Front National* was sent back to the political fringe. "A popular surge in votes for minor parties on the radical right is often followed by centre-right attempts to regain support by stealing their clothes."

BOGUS STANCE

What Miss Norris might also have said but did not say was that these postures by centre-right parties in trying to appear 'tough' on immigration have always been completely bogus. This was true of the postures adopted by Margaret Thatcher in Britain in 1979, just as it has been of those struck by M. Chirac across the Channel to head off the Le Pen threat. When in power, these parties have done absolutely nothing to stem the immigrant flood – and this will be the case in the future just as it has been in the past.

The posture now being adopted by the Tories under Michael Howard places the British National Party – Britain's only genuine, while at the same time serious, anti-immigration party – in an extremely difficult position. Had the BNP access to the press and air waves in the way the mainstream

parties do, it could to a great extent expose the thoroughly phoney tactics being used by the Tories for what they are, and highlight their actual record on the issue – including that of Mr. Howard himself. But because the BNP does not enjoy these facilities of mass communication it contests this month's election under an enormous handicap, just as the (British) National Front did 26 years ago.

This means that if BNP votes on May 6th do not measure up to its supporters' expectations and hopes, people should not be too ready to blame the party itself for any such disappointments.

HOWARD TACTICS PREDICTABLE

However, there is another side to the coin. The bogus Tory 'tough line' on immigration has been known about for a number of months, whilst the probability of it should have been known for a great deal longer. In addition to this, there should never have been any doubt that the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), later supplemented by Robert Kilroy-Silk's *Veritas* movement, would also be in the field making firm-sounding noises about immigration but equally with the same intention of never really *doing* anything about the nation's festering race problem. These two would – and will – also undoubtedly steal BNP votes this month.

BNP party electoral strategy should therefore be taking these dangers carefully into account. The most important lesson they provide is that the party stands, through no fault of its own, to lose many votes to the Tories and other parties and candidates running on fraudulent 'immigration-control' tickets, thus rendering spectacularly high votes very difficult to attain. It should therefore be concentrating its electioneering efforts on spreading its message as widely as possible, that is reaching the very maximum number of voters so as to leave its visiting card in homes up and down the country – with a view to local government elections next year and also to general recruitment.

As it is, much of this opportunity is being sacrificed in an attempt to score highly in just four special 'target' seats, while efforts in other seats are correspondingly diminished. Some branches which should be contesting seats are not being allowed to do so at all, while others are being directed to concentrate all their weekend campaigning manpower on the four specially targeted constituencies, at the expense of their local campaigns. It is a very high-risk strategy. Whether it comes off will very soon be known.

The things they're saying

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA

The beauty of postal voting is that it can be described by party hypocrites as increasing public participation in democracy. So it does, if you count giving your vote away – or consenting to have it prised away from you – as democracy.

But even the half-wits who do it know it's theft, and a corruption of the political process.

But let's not get too hoity toity about our wonderful democracy. Almost half of our electorate see no reason to bother voting – that's why they're such easy pickings for postal voting fraudsters...

Hardly anyone votes – or, indeed, is encouraged to vote – in the national interest. Few, myself included, would know what constituted the national interest if we fell over it in the street.

We merely make a vague punt for the party which appears to have made the most friendly noises in support of our interests, be it state benefits or private wealth.

The new postal voting scandal suggests the prospect of even greater, big-time corruption. In some marginal seats, applications for postal votes are up by 300 per cent. As turnout among genuine voters increases, the participation of bogus 'postal' voters rises.

As if straightforward democracy – bribing voters with illusory benefits and services – weren't bad enough!

PETER McKAY
Daily Mail (18.4.05)

Either Labour leaders knew the scale of corruption in postal voting and still pushed it, or they did not know, in which case why did they not check out the many concerns expressed?

The rot in New Labour starts at the top. The leader sets the standard of what is acceptable, and if lies, broken promises and deception are the norm to enable the triumph of his will, then activists down the line will follow the lead.

If New Labour wins the election because the electoral system does not allow people to select their true choice and corrupt postal votes swing some marginal seats, then Tony Blair will have a mandate to continue his dictatorial style of government.

S. EVANS
Metro newspaper, London (6.4.05)

"Make poverty history," the slogan of a group of fashionable charities patronised, needless to say, by Tony Blair, who has been seen wearing one of its modish wristbands, must be one of the most inane slogans ever known, even in an age devoted to such empty effusions. It is almost as fatuous in its way as the cry of "liberty or death" with which

Cuban telephone operators used to preface their answers to all enquiries.

The poverty referred to as one for consignment to history, as the saying is, is of course the poverty of Africa, allegedly due to unfair trading practices by the world's richer countries, and their refusal to cancel debts or provide more aid.

It is part of Tony Blair's much vaunted concern for Africa and his pompously named commission for that unfortunate continent, all of which is unlikely to achieve anything more than unparalleled effusions of hot air and stupendous gas baggery from the Master Gas Bag himself.

PETER SIMPLE
The Daily Telegraph (1.4.05)

Abortion, euthanasia, sex selection, living wills, asylum-seekers, immigration, crime and punishment, the collapse of the family and the rise of yob culture – there are a whole range of issues that cross party lines and do not fit neatly into their outdated left-right divide but which ordinary folk are discussing day in, day out.

The mainstream political élite would prefer these issues did not come to dominate our political debate because they think such matters are best resolved by them rather than the vulgar masses. But all the evidence, from continental Europe as well as Britain, is that the likes of the BNP gain support when mainstream politicians are seen to be ignoring the concerns of ordinary people.

ANDREW NEIL
The Sunday Times News Review (3.4.05)

Note how the immigration issue is referred to by many commentators variously as distasteful, unpleasant, dismaying, etc. But distasteful to whom? Ordinary voters are made of sterner stuff and find the issue normal and reasonable.

It is only those middle-class commentators with an overdeveloped and distorted sense of delicacy who complain. None of them, you may be sure, lives in areas of high immigration.

ANDREW ALEXANDER
Daily Mail (15.4.05)

How many terrorists were convicted of murdering the 668 soldiers killed during the Irish troubles? Four hundred? Three hundred? No, just 81. Which meant that the killers of the vast majority of soldiers went unpunished. Almost worse, most of those convicted of 'murder' were in fact bit-players; but the real killers – snipers, bomb-makers and landmine exploders – few of these terrorists have ever been punished for their crimes...

As the war against Islamic terrorism takes root in Britain, there must be a full reassessment of security policy in Northern Ireland. Lesson one is that it is morally wrong for a government to be more concerned about the legal rights of its enemies than the lives of its servants. Lesson two is that heavy-handed, indiscriminate actions against civilian populations by the security forces only help terrorists. Lesson three is that those who preach civil liberties cannot disclaim moral and personal responsibility for the deeds that the terrorist beneficiaries of such liberties later perform.

Last but not least, lesson four: the result of allowing anti-terrorist policy to become the forensic plaything of the courts will be certain, abject failure... That so many soldiers were killed and no one was jailed is simply a massive defeat for law and a comparable victory for terrorist outlaws, who must have thought that they were fighting pedantic, dysfunctional fools. For years, they were.

KEVIN MYERS
The Sunday Telegraph (17.4.05)

Prince Charles and I have met twice. Once at Prince Pavlo's wedding and once at Highgrove. The first time he asked me who had mugged me. I corrected him, saying I had been attacked but not mugged. "Who were they?" "They were the kind you would like to see more of in the Guards," I answered. He didn't like it. "I'd love to see a whole brigade of black Guards," he said, and then turned away. He is, poor man, obviously politically correct, but then he's not likely to be mugged, is he?

'TAKI'
The Spectator (16.4.05)

Eight years ago I battled, almost alone, against the tide, trying to explain why New Labour would be a disaster and why Princess Tony should not be "given a chance." Many Tories seemed unable to see the danger and voted for him.

Now I'm having the same difficulty as I urge you all to ditch the useless Tory Party, which, in the unlikely event it wins, will betray you as it has done for the past 50 years.

I suspect that some of the same slow learners who were fooled by Mr. Blair in 1997 are being fooled by Mr. Howard now.

Which Mr. Howard is the real one? The man who acts concerned about immigration, Europe, travellers' camps and human rights? Or the man in a government that dragged us deeper than ever into the EU?

PETER HITCHENS
The Mail on Sunday (27.3.05)

THE ROVER DEBACLE: CAN WE SINK ANY LOWER?



IN THE long, depressing history of post-war British decline there have been certain defining moments, moments in which the whole sorry saga has been symbolised by one degrading and humiliating event. One such moment was the launching, at Southampton in January 2004, of the new ocean-going liner *Queen Mary 2*. Flags were flown. Public dignitaries of every kind were present. TV and other media hype served to create the illusion of a great national occasion. Yet the reality was that this great vessel had been built in France, by the Alstom company of Le Havre, the construction having been commissioned by its owners Cunard, now under American proprietorship. The nation which once built the world's greatest ships could not find a yard of its own with the resources to manage such a project; but it nevertheless managed to deceive itself that the moment was one to celebrate.

Last month we witnessed another national debacle which, as a symptom of where half a century of misrule has brought us, said it all. The fate of our sole remaining British-owned volume car manufacturer, MG Rover, hung upon whether our Government could persuade a Chinese motor company to buy the firm out and keep its 8,000 Longbridge workers in employment. The company, the state-owned Shanghai Automotive Industry Corporation, would not play ball on the terms the Government was willing to offer, and MG Rover went into oblivion.

It was fairly typical of the mentality of British politicians of the present kidney that many New Labour apologists whined about the Chinese letting them down rather than blame themselves.

British motor industry wipe-out

There is now not a single car manufacturer in this country of any real significance that is owned by British capital and thus controlled from Britain. Ford, Vauxhall and Jaguar are the property of parent companies in the United States, which dictate policy and reap the profits. Rolls Royce/Bentley is in the hands of the Germans, having been sold to Volkswagen in 1998. Nissan, Toyota and Honda all have factories in Britain that are doing well but the companies are Japanese, not British; and the workers in those factories are at the mercy of their foreign owners when decisions affecting their livelihoods are made.

It is much the same in the field of commercial vehicles. Of the heavy lorries on our roads a majority are made abroad, mostly

in France, Germany and Sweden. Of the companies making them here, only Dennis, now specialising in dustcarts, is British-owned.

Does ownership matter? A very substantial body of opinion in the world of British

"... when a foreign nation does direct its excess cash to a nation suffering a deficit, that money usually returns in the form of investments or in fixed-interest debt. Those assets thereby become the property of a foreign owner and their earnings flow to that owner. To illustrate the conse-

JOHN TYNDALL surveys the fruits of decades of betrayal, indifference and neglect

business and politics believes it does not. We are now in a global economy, they will say; industry and commerce are global; ownership might be based anywhere, and what is important is that they operate efficiently and profitably. Sir John Harvey-Jones, former ICI chairman and a leading figure in the British business world, doesn't agree. In an article in *The Observer* on 2nd November 1997, just when the sell-out of Rolls Royce was imminent, he wrote:-

"... if ownership doesn't matter, why are so many companies willing to pay over the odds for it?

"In the transfer of ownership overseas it isn't just the fact that the profits go out of our country - there are all sorts of other effects as well. Much though I admire the Nissan plant in Sunderland - one of the most efficient in that group - and much though I acknowledge the dynamic effect on suppliers in the UK and on the community, does anyone really think that the 3,500 people employed equate to the numbers employed at Nissan HQ in Japan?"

In other words, the jobs provided the Sunderland workforce amount to mere crumbs from the Japanese table. Then the late Sir James Goldsmith, writing in his book *The Trap*, opposed foreign ownership from a somewhat different angle:-

quences, imagine a game of poker in which you lose more cash than you possess. Instead of paying in cash, you hand over ownership of your house and you continue to live in it as a tenant paying rent. Are we seriously to believe that such a transaction has had a nil effect on your financial position?"

The dynamic of the free-enterprise system, and the main reason why it performs so immeasurably better than a communist-type economy, lies in the fact that it operates according to nature's law of the survival of the fittest, with the weaker going to the wall. This is well and fine if we are looking at things at the level of our local high street. Brown is a local family butcher who has been supplying the community for many years. Then one day Jones, another butcher, opens up a shop just a short distance down the road. It soon turns out that Jones offers his customers meat of better quality and at lower prices than Brown. The latter's customers gradually go over to Jones. His business thrives and Brown's declines. Eventually we see a 'For Sale' sign going up on Brown's premises. His butcher's shop is no more.

Nearly everyone benefits. Jones and his family benefit, obviously. The local community benefits: it gets better meat at better prices. Only Brown and his family fail to benefit. Sad for them, but that is the way of

ROVER'S AT
LONGBRIDGE
Dependence on
Chinese did not
save it



the world. The onus is on Brown to find more gainful employment elsewhere.

But when we look at this dynamic operating at the level of international business competition the picture is infinitely more complex. When a vital industry, employing many thousands of workers, is put out of business by a foreign competitor, great numbers of people are affected – and not necessarily through any fault of their own. The unsuccessful competitor is not replaced by a successful competitor just up the road; he is replaced by one operating many hundreds, even thousands, of miles away – moreover one under the jurisdiction of a foreign government which no doubt operates entirely different rules affecting industry and commerce. That government can manipulate the rules to benefit its own traders at the expense of the traders of rival countries, including ours.


Attitude of responsible government

And this is indeed what responsible governments do. They recognise an obligation to maintain vital industries within their own borders. If a particular industry, through bad management, becomes non-viable and in danger of going out of business, a responsible government cannot be other than concerned and involved. A particular company may in certain circumstances be left to sink or swim – if the business it loses goes to another company of the same kind operating within the same national economic framework. But when a whole industry – or at least a major part of it – is faced with the choice of foreign takeover or ruin, responsible government cannot be indifferent to such a development. It must intervene by whatever means are necessary to keep the industry alive and under national ownership and control.

This was often done in Britain until the Thatcher era, when the received wisdom changed and government completely abdicated any obligation to protect and nurture British industries, no matter how vital. But the trouble with the pre-Thatcher policy was that it operated in a global business environment which rendered help and salvation to British companies wholly ineffective as long as the global market dictated sales. Rover (previously British Leyland) was the most typical case in point. Had protective measures been adopted so as to close the British market to foreign-produced vehicles, the company would have had far better chances of survival because sales in Britain would have assisted volume production, which was never possible under the conditions that then existed. Not surprisingly, the attempts to bail out Leyland/Rover came to nothing.

Just what is wrong with the British motor industry? Enough words have been written on this subject to fill several large libraries, but almost always they deal with symptoms

**ROLLS
ROYCE**
Sold to the
Germans with
no opposition
from govern-
ment and very
littlenationwide



rather than causes. A typical case was an article written by Geoffrey Owen in *The Spectator* on 30th October 1999. Owen's analysis was sound enough as far as it went. He spoke of bad management decisions concerning markets to aim for. He stressed poor factory-floor performance. He mentioned bad labour problems, particularly at Leyland.

But what was lacking in all this was the fundamental question: why? Motor-producing countries abroad have basically the same problems to deal with as Britain does. Their performance, just like ours, is governed by human limitations. They have owners and managements who can make mistakes (as evidenced in the disastrous decision of BMW in Germany to buy Rover). They have workers probably not of any higher standard than ours. They have labour disputes to deal with, just as we do.

Different policies abroad

Yet Germany, France and Japan, for example, have strong domestically owned motor industries. What is the essential difference? Simple. None of them is so completely besotted with international free-market philosophies that it does not regard the preservation of motor manufacturing, as with other departments of manufacturing, as a matter of grave national responsibility, warranting where necessary the intervention of government. Government, they accept, is where the buck stops. In Britain it is habitual to pass the buck around in never-ending circles, with everybody blaming everybody else, and it all ending in just a shrug of the shoulders as if nothing really mattered very much. It was in this atmosphere that the takeover of Rolls Royce by the Germans was accompanied by only the mildest nostalgia but nothing in the way of enraged national protest, least of all government action.

In the case of Rover, the cars the company has been making in recent years have not been at all bad, and the Rover 75 model is acknowledged as one of the best. The simple problem is the cars have not been selling on anything like the scale for the company to remain profitable. Could this

have been remedied? Yes it could, but not for as long as government in Britain remained in the rut of present thinking. A British home market closed to imported cars would have easily absorbed Rover's maximum production capacity – and much more besides. But we are not allowed to do that – or, rather, EU rules would not allow us to do it; and the Government is unprepared to defy EU rules.

Then to make Rover's products more competitive internationally a vast volume of new investment would have had to be brought into the company to expand sales and advertising networks, servicing and spares facilities and the like. With Rover as rocky as it has been, it is understandable that would-be investors have been reluctant to provide this. Here is where state enterprise on a huge scale would be necessary, but the whole British political mindset of today prohibits this. In fact, state ownership and control of an industry is by no means a guarantee that it will be inefficient and uncompetitive. The Chinese company, SAIC, is indeed state-owned, as mentioned earlier; and it is somewhat ironic that such a company was looked to to save the privately owned Rover. The mighty Volkswagen began in 1937 with a combination of state and private enterprise, with a design from Ferdinand Porsche and subsidies provided by the German Auto Dealers' Association.

Money for overseas

Hoping for large-scale private investment right now as a means of saving Rover would be impractical, given its performance and reputation. But taking British manufacturing industry as a whole, including the presently successful British subsidiaries of Japanese motor companies, it is scandalous that foreign – euphemistically called 'inward' – investment is relied upon for our factories to stay in business and expand. British investment in companies overseas is simply enormous. It accounts for a quarter of the world's total foreign investment and is something like a third larger than that of the United States. In the industrial field, British capital invested abroad is around fifty per

Contd. overleaf

THE ROVER DEBACLE: CAN WE SINK ANY LOWER?

(Contd. from prev. page)

cent larger in total than that invested in the United Kingdom, accounting in 2003 to a staggering £2,420 billion.

Only those fixated on the supposedly self-justifying virtues of 'globalism' – to the exclusion of basic economic common sense – can see anything good in foreign companies owning a huge and expanding slice of British industry while British money that could buy back that industry for Britain is spread like confetti around the world.

Contrasting philosophies

Here is revealed the sharp contrast between the so-called 'Anglo-Saxon' and 'European' economic philosophies. In the 'Anglo-Saxon' tradition government should absent itself as far as possible from the interplay of economic forces. Of course, in Britain, the United States and other countries answering to this description, this has not always happened, but it remains the economic ideal; and today it is far advanced in its application. When visiting the US last year I was struck by the huge percentage of motor cars on the roads bearing imported brands, a sure disaster in the making for the formerly supreme American motor industry. The tendency has perhaps gone even further than in Britain, where it has gone quite far enough.

The 'European' tradition is markedly different. Continental European thinking has always recognised home industries as vital components of independent nationhood, with strategic and military considerations taken into account just as well as economic ones. Again, the philosophy is not applied with absolute purity; market forces are allowed to regulate trade to some extent, albeit a lesser one. But the principle is broadly and generally upheld that government is responsible for a nation's economic health, and that it should intervene in the workings of private commercial forces where a vital national interest is thought to be at stake. Sometimes this does not happen in practice, but the article of faith remains.

Japanese economic thinking is, of course, much more in line with the European one; and it is applied much more rigidly. Government, industry and commerce are seen as integral weapons in a policy of national economic self-defence and development. Thus it would be inconceivable that a company such as, for instance, Nissan would be allowed to go to the wall merely because of bad management at boardroom or shop-floor level. The state would take a hand because the preservation of a vital national asset would be regarded as of far higher priority than some abstract economic principle.

Episodes like the Rover fiasco are going to recur as long as government in Britain –

whether of the Labour or Tory variety – remains imprisoned in the old free-trading approach. It is not a paradox to say that while we should resist European political and economic integration we should lean much more towards European – and more still Japanese – attitudes in respect of the fusion of political and economic policy, and acceptance of ultimate political responsibility for a nation's industrial fate.

What government must do

Coming from the realms of philosophy and principle to that of practical application, this means that British Government must set in stone a policy of preserving British economic independence, and to that end must protect all vital areas of manufacturing, farming and fisheries in the United Kingdom from the dangers posed by international economic forces – just as it is the responsibility of any government to protect the national borders against invasion, whether military or migratory.

In specific terms, this means two things above all else. British producers, whether of

primary or secondary goods, must be given favoured access – and where necessary *sole* access – to the British market; and British business assets must be kept under British ownership and control. The latter need would require close government regulation of the movements of British investment capital so as to ensure that the bulk of it is directed to the economy here at home rather than abroad. This was not a matter of the same urgency in the 19th century, when there existed no danger of foreigners gobbling up our nation's wealth; but the urgency is self-evident now.

In other words, finance should cease to be a free agent, with loyalty to no nation, but should become the handmaiden of our own domestic economy, obligated to Britain, and managed so as to fuel British productive forces. Finance, to put it in a nutshell, should be national rather than international.

These principles and policies, quite normal in many countries, are revolutionary to Britain in her present condition and with her prevailing ways of thinking. But they are essential if the current trend of industrial meltdown is to be reversed.

DVDs for your collection

Tyr Services are pleased to announce the production of three new items on DVD. All DVDs/Double DVDs cost just £12 each, including postage, and are available from Tyr Services, CM Tyr, London WC1N 3XX. Please make cheques/postal orders out to 'Tyr Services'.



'Save the BNP!' protest rally (above picture), Milton Keynes, 20th February 2005, organised by the Spearhead Group.

This production has already proved to be our most popular DVD to date, and contains thought-provoking and inspirational speeches by a whole host of top nationalist speakers, including **Eddy Morrison, Steve Smith, Keith Axon, Peter Rushton, Sharon Pastou, Tess Culnane, Richard Edmonds** and **John Tyndall**. This also includes the presentation by Richard Edmonds of a long-service award to former BNP Councillor Derek Beackon. Meeting chaired by **Ian Edward**. *Double DVD. £12.00.*

British National Party meeting, East London, 9th March 2003.

This DVD contains speeches by **Chris Roberts, Richard Edmonds** and **John Tyndall** at a great nationalist rally. Meeting chaired by **John Morse**. *DVD. £12.00.*

British National Party meeting, Ruislip, 8th February 2004.

This double DVD contains speeches by **Tess Culnane, Peter Shaw, Tony Wentworth** and **John Tyndall**. Meeting chaired by **Ian Edward**. *Double DVD. £12.00.*

LONDON ELECTION RALLY

SUNDAY, 10th April saw the second London BNP rally of the year take place. The primary reason for the meeting being called was to motivate activists into preparing, promoting and campaigning for the general election on May 5th and also to raise the much needed funds to finance the whole endeavour.

The meeting was excellently chaired by Havering BNP branch organiser Alan Bailey. The first to speak was the party's group development officer Tony Lecomber, who gave a broad outline of the election and the party's strategy. Next was BNP cultural officer Jonathan Bowden, who gave an energetic address describing the terrible state of affairs in relation to electoral fraud in last year's local elections and its ramifications for this year's general election.

London regional organiser Richard Barnbrook followed with an appeal for all to get involved with the campaign in the party's target parliamentary constituency of Barking (where he is the candidate) in the final weeks of the run up to May 5th. After a short break, BNP chairman Nick Griffin took to the top table. Mr. Griffin described the way the media, banks and authorities had been working against the party to undermine its support but said that this was having



Nick Griffin speaks. Seated are (from left): Jonathan Bowden, Alan Bailey (meeting chairman) and Richard Barnbrook.

no effect, as it had overcome all hurdles in its way. He continued, speaking about the problems of multi-culturalism and its effects on Keighley, Yorkshire, the seat he will be contesting, and the ways in which the powers-that-be sweep all this under the carpet, pretending there is no race problem. He finished by saying that the party will, hopefully, do

very well in several constituencies up and down the country and could, possibly, achieve some good second and third places. A collection of over £1,700 was made, and the meeting ended with a rendition of the hymn *Jerusalem*. Just over 60 members were present.

REPORT BY BOB GERTNER

London & SE BNP candidates on parade

Before Parliament :
Back row left to right:
Tim Rait (Maidenhead);
Cliff Le May (Uxbridge);
Jay Lee (Bexley heath
& Crayford); Barry
Roberts (Eltham); Terry
Farr (Enfield N.); John
McCaffrey (Romford);
Andrew Emerson
(Brombourne); Bryn
Robinson (Billericay).
Front row left to right:
Brian Ravenscroft
(Erith & Thamesmead);
Julian Leppert (Epping
Forest); Tony Hazell
(Hayes & Harlington);
Richard Barnbrook
(Barking); Lawrence
Rustem (Dagenham);
Emma Colgate (Basil-
don); Roger Robertson
(Basingstoke); Ian
Moore (Hornchurch).



Election Day: what a choice!

WHILE the media and the tiny Westminster political coterie are getting excited over the General Election, most of the public are not. They have come to the same realisation as we did long ago: that a vote for Conservative or Labour is nothing more than offering assent to a bizarre farce, a simulacrum of democracy.

Blair or Howard? It's like a choice between bubonic plague and cholera, with yet more degradation and more destruction of our national honour and freedom in the pipeline. Unsurprisingly, it is predicted that turnout of eligible voters this month will be lower than in 1918, when millions of soldiers were absent.

Blair's press release announcing the May 5th poll date was written in the usual patronising, simplistic and semi-literate style that characterises government forms and pamphlets. In it I note that this man(?) lays great stress on his alleged achievements in healthcare and policing.


Evidently, the poor dear is so divorced from reality that he hasn't noticed Nottinghamshire Chief Constable Steve Green's admission that his force is losing control. Nottingham is now the scene of so many murders that the police struggle to cope. With drug-related violence, large areas of dereliction, a vanished coalfield and a paucity of legitimate employment, Nottingham would seem to sum up Blair's seedy and exhausted Britain.

Then there is healthcare. Blair's rose-tinted picture would seem to have nothing in common with the reality of some of the filthiest and most disease-ridden hospitals in the developed world. But no doubt he would not need to worry personally about MRSA when he'd only be attending somewhere like 'St. Bilderberger's Private Hospital for the Demented'.

PLIGHT OF ROVER WORKERS

Oh, and dear me, there's something about 'hard-won economic stability' and making it last for the future. Try telling that to the workers at Rover's Longbridge plant! At the time of writing, they face a very bleak future, a rescue bid involving a takeover by the Shanghai Automotive Industrial Corporation having failed. Politicians

lament the plight of MG Rover, but they lament and do nothing, as has been the pattern for years. Thousands of workers in ancillary industries will also lose their jobs, to be absorbed no doubt into 'invisible unemployment', in reality possibly as high as seven million, but kept artificially low by various devices. All recent governments



**THE DEVIL AND
THE DEEP BLUE
SEA
The British
people's options
on the 5th of this
month**

have shamefully lied – over and over again – on this matter and many others.

Political shysters like Blair and Howard, of course, can see nothing wrong with having important industries snapped up by foreign buyers. It is a direct consequence of years of economic failure that neither dares to face, preferring to take refuge in a nether world of fantasy and spin. How many large or even medium-sized businesses in this country remain in British hands?

Some readers will have heard of Edgar J. Steele, who has won a reputation in

IAN BUCKLEY takes a look at two bogus 'alternatives'

America as an 'Attorney to the Damned'. Steele will represent those activists who are classed as 'extremists' or 'haters' by the system. Interestingly enough, these are people who *don't* believe in bombing Arabs or in dismantling ancient civil liberties.

When we take a look at the two main candidates in the election – lawyers both – who can doubt the veracity of Steele's words, when he speaks from the experience

of being a law school graduate himself: "Law school breeds a***holes. It makes bigger a***holes out of those who are a***holes to begin with and it attracts a***holes like moths to a flame."

LAWYERS' CLUB

Surely it is not altogether healthy to have both Government and Opposition benches composed almost entirely of lawyers. Their entire working lives prior to politics have been spent in a foetid atmosphere of chicanery, concealment and deceit, an appropriate preparation for the Westminster world of bullying whips and their 'dirt books'. Is there even one among them with a science or engineering degree?

It was Richard Ingrams who made the perceptive comment that there was very little community left in Britain today, and least of all was there any sort of 'gay community'. This is confirmed by the example of

Blackpool, once a cheerful working-class holiday resort, but now a leading haunt for homosexuals. According to the statistics, Blackpool today is not at all gay (in the old sense), with just about the highest rates of sex-related disease, premature death, suicide and alcohol abuse around anywhere. Nevertheless, Blair and Howard were both keen to seek the electoral support of this so-called 'community'.

This piece of toadying was covered in the 'What We Think' column last month; but omitted from most of the press reports

of Blair's interview with the 'gay' magazine *Attitude* were the following comments from the phoney Labour top man about a gay school friend: "I had a good friend who was absolutely terrified that his parents would ever find out. I knew at the time, within the milieu I was in, that it wasn't a problem."

Nor was this the only desperate attempt to drum up votes; this bad joke of a Prime Minister also ludicrously made an appearance on the Saturday night *Ant and Dec Show*, being interviewed by two small boys. On reflection, this is probably the best audience for his message that Blair is ever likely to get: "Go on Tony, tell us a scary story." "Which one would you most like to hear, boys: the Bogeyman, the Wicked Witch or the Iraqi WMDs?"

Yes, fear is one way the front-men of the international financial racket keep us quiet, with those handy adult bogeymen of al Qa'eda for instance. We are petrified with talk of 'inevitable' attacks on London, with dozens of actors falling over in farcical

exercises simulating urban chemical or biological warfare.

Hey chaps, if there ever were such an attack it might not be by militant Muslims anyway. Think of the parallel of the US anthrax incidents, accompanied by notes signing off with the words 'Allah is Great'. A genuine Muslim might have written 'God is Great' or 'Allah Akhbar', but would hardly combine English and Arabic in the same short sentence. A nice try at deception, but a little sloppy! Not all of us have been rendered completely somnolent and uncritical by a diet of soaps and trash TV, you know!

LABOUR PERVERT

It's unfortunate that the New Labour minister with responsibility for preventing terrorism, Hazel Blears, had to lose a valued assistant recently. This was Peter Tuffley, arrested on suspicion of having abducted a 13-year-old boy for sexual purposes. Tuffley, once a regional organiser for phoney Labour,

had made contact with the boy through a 'gay' internet chat room. Is it any wonder that Blair wishes to continue "reforming the criminal justice system," perhaps to make sure that his own functionaries don't end up convicted of sex crimes! Nor are dodgy associations only the prerogative of Blair's lot; Michael Howard has – shall we say – an interesting cousin, known to the law.

Blair climaxed his initial election address with a passionate if illiterate appeal demanding: "A country where people who play by the rules get on, and those who don't don't." The opposite of the truth, I'm sure you'll agree.

In conclusion, if you are an Albanian asylum-seeker who'd like a nice flat with a free TV licence thrown in, or an Israeli government minister who wants some Arab country's capital flattened, then – yes, this pair do indeed have something to offer.

But to the rest of us they represent an utterly risible and bogus choice between two tired time-servers of a corrupt system.

MADHOUSE BRITAIN

LINDA CURRIE manages an off-licence in Anfield, Liverpool. Recently, three youths came into her shop, one of whom demanded money and began kicking the reinforced glass screen protecting the till and staff until it cracked. Mrs. Currie pressed a panic button and the youth ran off.

Two witnesses separately rang 999 to report the incident. In the meantime, it had all been recorded on CCTV. In addition, Mrs. Currie had recognised the culprit and knew where he lived.

Two police officers arrived 20 minutes later. When Mrs. Currie offered to supply them with the CCTV tape, they were just not interested. She then told them where they could find the raider, but they replied that there was no point in going round to see him as he would simply deny everything that had happened – despite the fact that his picture and voice were on the film.

* * *

MEANWHILE, down in Cambridgeshire the county police force have just spent £10,000 of taxpayers' money on a CD produced for travellers (i.e. gypsies) who consider they have been victimised.

Some 2,000 copies of the 25-minute recording are being handed out at sites across Cambridgeshire, urging members of the travelling community to contact the police if they feel they have suffered 'discrimination' or 'harassment'.

Villagers living near the huge illegal settlement at Smithy Fen, near Cottenham, are enraged. One of them, Jacqueline Smith, said: "From my point of view we are more the victims here. They should be spending money on extra police in the village. We experience anti-social behaviour and damage to property. Every time we call the police, they won't go on the site as it's so big."

The CD has been funded from Home Office

money given to each police force to tackle 'race crimes'. In a Daily Mail report on 31st March it was stated: "As well as the 2,000 for distribution to travellers, a further 500 have been given to Cambridgeshire police officers and other forces interested in using the material."

* * *

TONY BENNETT is the landlord of The Otter pub in Thorpe Marriott, near Norwich. A while ago he applied for a licence to stay open beyond hours to mark the Chinese New Year. He had no trouble.

But then he made an application for a similar late licence to mark St. George's Day. This time he was refused.

* * *

A CASE only recently came to light involving the arrest of 10 illegal immigrants last year in Swindon, Wiltshire, which has become a dumping ground for people being smuggled into Britain in the backs of lorries.

Local police chiefs contacted immigration officers for guidance on how to start deportation procedures. They were told to release the immigrants while a map was faxed to the police to give to them showing how they could find their way to the Home Office reporting centre in Croydon. They never turned up.

A Police Federation spokesman in Wiltshire said that the release of such arrested immigrants is now standard procedure throughout the country.

* * *

THAMES VALLEY Police have introduced a points system aimed at encouraging officers to make more arrests. More points will be given for arrests for driving offences than of illegal immigrants.

Officers have been told they must reach 200 points per month. An officer will get 10 points for arresting a burglary or rape suspect, five for

catching a driver talking on a mobile while at the wheel but only two points for apprehending an illegal immigrant.

* * *

COUNCIL officials in Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, have banned some pensioners from using paper napkins with their meals on wheels service in case they choke on them.

The bureaucrats are carrying out a thorough 'risk assessment' before allowing elderly or disabled people to be given a serviette. The cost to local taxpayers of this assessment operation is not known.

* * *

BRISTOL City Council has instituted a 'Festival of Ideas', a week-long event to take place later this month, which will be sponsored by the Bristol Cultural Development Partnership, a body funded by lottery hand-outs and by the local taxpayers. It will employ a former pop performer, Pat Kane, to spend the week doing nothing but thinking up 'cultural ideas'. The precise figure for Mr. Kane's salary has not been disclosed.

* * *

THE Metropolitan Police are recruiting 24 civilian advisers on race and 'gay' issues – at a cost to the taxpayers of more than £1 million a year. These people, referred to as 'Citizen Focus' advisers, will be paid £35,000 a year each.

The scheme has not gone down too well with former Flying Squad commander John O'Connor, who has said: "The troops on the ground will not be happy."

* * *

YOUNG Harry Saunders (7) was misbehaving a bit when on a shopping trip with his parents near South Ockendon, in Essex. His dad, John, after giving him a verbal ticking off with no positive result, slapped him on the legs.

Four days later, two police officers appeared at Mr. Saunders' front door. A passer-by had seen the incident, taken his car number and reported him! No further action was taken.

Sleaze and criminality behind the immigrant invasion

THE government's own statistics show that Britain has undergone a racial transformation within the last 30 years that has no parallel anywhere in the world. Further, what is happening has not been justified by any economic, moral or social factors, and has a strong whiff of authoritarianism and gerrymandering about it.

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) says that of a six-million increase in national population predicted for the next 25 years, five million will be immigrants and their children. At present the rate of immigration is so high that the ONS, in March, said that almost 20 per cent of babies born in this country are the offspring of first-generation immigrants themselves. In Birmingham, Bradford, Leicester, Manchester and Slough, the ONS recorded that more than 30 per cent of new births were to foreign-born mothers – and this, remember, is excluding births to ethnic-minority mothers born in the UK.

These cities are all expected to have coloured majorities by 2020, and coloured people could be in the majority (at 60 per cent) in the country as a whole by 2100. This will happen even if migration is merely reduced to something like 30,000 a year. In other words, the term 'ethnic minorities' will apply to the white British themselves in their own country. Already, the most common name now given to registrars listing new births is Mohammed!

STOPPING THE INFLUX IS NOT ENOUGH

Even if all immigration were stopped right now, the high birth rate of the coloured population, combined with an inevitable increase in white Britons leaving the country, will ensure that its numbers will rise to about 30 per cent of the UK total by 2100 (bear in mind that there was a net outflow of 600,000 white British people between 1998 and 2003).

The coloured communities will be concentrated in most towns and cities of 80,000 population and above. Most of the white British will be found in the small towns and enclaves of less than 20,000, but many of them will themselves have become a *diaspora* in other parts of Europe. The Church of England will eventually die out, and Islam could well become the major religion by 2100.

One explanation for what has happened is that fanatical ideologues have taken over this country and have turned a blind eye to massive Mafia-like criminality that puts even the robber barons of Russia to shame. 'Immigration' is simply mass-settlement by another name. Most asylum-seekers are not destitute or fleeing persecution by the police forces of rogue states, because – by definition – if they were they would not be allowed to leave their countries in the first place. And if they are wanted for crimes committed elsewhere, we have no right to give them shelter; nor should we want to add criminal elements to our population anyway.

Many refugees say they come in pursuit of the rule of law, but start out by breaking the law the moment they set foot in Britain, by claiming public funds and housing by deception through the telling of bogus hard-luck stories.

Myles Harris, in his book about the immigration racket called *Tomorrow is Another Country*, points out that British citizenship is now a valuable commodity that can be traded through arranged marriages to people in third world countries.

Sophisticated factories now make high-grade forgeries of birth and marriage certificates, and even of Euro and British passports.

In 1999 Labour did away with the rule, introduced by the Tories, that outlawed bogus marriage scams. These scams were, and have since been, clearly used as a way of getting into the country. This was another sign of government collusion in illegality. In the meantime, bigamous and multiple marriage rackets are allowed to continue. But both these factors are direct results of the various nationality acts that have been passed that have enabled foreign coloured people to call themselves

ANTONY MILNE blows the whistle on some of the rackets – including ones enjoying the support of government



BRITAIN HERE WE COME!

Another bunch on the way. But even if further immigration were stopped, British people would remain minorities in many parts of their own country, says the writer.

'British' in the first place (all this criminal lunacy started with Labour's 1948 Nationality Act. This stems from the totalitarian idea that that nationality and citizenship are in the gift of politicians (what is known as the *jus soli* principle), to be given to, or taken away from, people, rather than being the product of ancestry).

The 1951 Geneva Convention says that refugees must seek sanctuary in the first safe haven they come to, so in theory Britain should not have to take any at all. Further, the refugees are not destitute, says Harris; otherwise the smuggling gangs would not have lent them the money to get to the West. He points out that the vast majority of illegal settlers claim asylum rather than await discovery. That way, benefits, accommodation and some semblance of legality are available to them free of charge, and the lengthy appeal process means there will be time to contact gangs or relatives in regard to permanent housing and perhaps work in the black economy. In any event, the smuggling gangs will want to be repaid when the migrants reach Britain and work in our illegal sweatshops.

SCANDAL OF THE MOXON AFFAIR

The civil service has long been corrupted by this relentless shady tide of immigration, as Steve Moxon also points out in his *The Great Immigration Scandal*. He describes how the bureaucrats have become a tool of a dishonest Soviet style government.

Moxon worked for the Home Office 'Managed Migration' unit in Sheffield, but soon discovered that our immigration laws were being cynically ignored.

The case officers knew that so many 'asylum-seekers' simply vanished when they set foot in Britain that they were under great pressure to grant residence applications as fast as possible. This was done in order to supply spurious information to the ONS, and to calm fears that asylum was getting out of control. So the figures were doctored so that categories of visa-holders and asylum-seekers were changed. To keep the asylum numbers down, the applicants were simply given work permits!

Chaos and incompetence abound. Applications for settlement on the basis of marriage are not properly checked because the languages are not known, nor are case workers able to identify bogus documents or passports. All visas, 'student' documents and other ID papers are taken on trust. And no attempt is made to check who is leaving and who is staying, or who has overstayed his visa time-limit.


Moxon said that when some of the tabloids started to create a fuss about immigration a fast-tracking system was desperately put into operation, which was similar to the staff of a fraudulent bank trashing its files before the auditors arrive. Applications were simply dumped into plastic pouches and sent into the 'application granted' out-box.

Hardly surprisingly, when Moxon went public with his criticisms, he was promptly sacked. The character assassins in the media, such as journalists at the left-wing *Independent*, described Moxon's book as 'a crude and inflammatory, anti-immigrant tract', 'an Asian-bashing rant', and an 'Islamophobic rant'. As a direct result of the *Independent* article, David Davies, the Conservative Shadow Home Secretary, cravenly ducked out of Moxon's book launch, which he had previously agreed to attend.

The consequences of all this illegality are made worse by the catastrophic shift in the character of this country that is taking place, which bodes ill for the future since it affects so many aspects of our national existence. We are already massively overcrowded, and the implications



**Moxon and book (right).
He was sacked for telling
the truth.**



for housing and the destruction of our countryside, lack of social cohesion, issues of identity, and problems relating to ethnic tension loom starkly.

COUNTRY NO LONGER STABLE

A Britain that was once stable, cohesive, prosperous and law-abiding is no longer so, because the multi-cultural ideology of the politicians who are causing all the trouble is still in place and shows no sign of being rejected by them. The immigration saga will overwhelm the political and economic agenda to the end of this century, and probably for all time – unless something drastic is done to turn things around.

Most importantly, academe and intellectualism will suffer, since there will inevitably be contested narratives as to how this situation came about. As the ethnic population grows and becomes more influential, it will have a greater say in how British history will be interpreted. And this will be complicated by the different narratives that will arise from the various ethnic groups and nationalities. But it is hard to see how the 'asylum racket' and 'invasion/colonization' arguments can ever be rebutted or lived down.

A lot of people, by their very visible presence, because they clearly acted under their own free will, will be viewed as responsible for past and present wrongdoing and the perpetuation of injustice. Even those who are the offspring of immigrants seem to have done nothing to help stop further immigration, nor have ever felt any guilt about what has happened.

Mainstream political parties would be foolish to continue to let ethnic candidates stand for election, because if they do it will mean that the political system will be increasingly dominated in coming decades with clan rivalries as more coloured MPs are elected by coloured constituents. Once they get into government, they will open the immigration doors still wider in order to get more of their own into the country so that they can press claims for more rights and privileges against other groups. We would become like an Afghanistan or Malaysia.

We must not let that happen, and the first step is to ensure that more British Nationalist candidates get elected, and the numerical strength of the present white British population be galvanized into political action.

WITH all the forces of national and international governments, global media empires and international financiers massed against us, we should take heart in the fact that there is a solution to our plight, and that provided we are prepared to do the things that need to be done we can win. But first, we must acknowledge some very simple truths, not least about the people we are fighting. Whilst we continue wasting time, for example, believing that our political masters are incompetent and/or naïve in their egalitarian beliefs, we continue to provide them with the time they so desperately need to take our race and nation beyond a point of no return.

The truth is that their fake morality and pretence of caring about the 'less fortunate' are diversions from the fact that they are deliberately engaged in a covert war to destroy our racial and cultural environment. We should not therefore play into their hands wasting our time being deliberately distracted by their fraudulent and bogus arguments. What we should do, instead, is simply recognise the fact that our enemies wish to see the very end of who and what we are, to facilitate their creation of a one-world race of hybrids and mongrels, without history identity or purpose.

We are, of course, at a great disadvantage with our enemies in control of the mass media. However, television, radio and even the newspapers are no match for courage and imagination, both of which we have in abundance and which if used in a sincere and honest manner will be supported by the public. To expose these enemies as I believe we must, we first have to resolve to tell the truth – a theme on which I have written previously but which can always do with repeating. Anything less than the truth is futile, and our enemies know it!

Again, to repeat something I have said before, we must also conquer fear. To live in fear of doing what needs to be done is to be a slave trapped in a cell where truth and light are absent. If you are not constrained by fear nor feel compelled to submit to what you do not like, you can become very dangerous to our enemies indeed! In this regard I believe we must rediscover our roots. We must gather up our people in the ancient towns and market squares of Britain and rally them to our cause. We must walk and talk amongst them and connect with them as leaders used to do. We must demonstrate in numbers and become more involved in high-profile street-level activities and protests. Nothing else will do! There is no substitute for eye-to-eye contact, handshaking and powerful

The paramount need is to conquer fear

oratory, distributing our message as we go. With this new approach we can smash the psychological stranglehold our enemies have over our people.

When depth and sincerity challenge shallowness and cynicism, there can only ever be one winner. In truth, there is no other way of beating our foes; anything less will be laughed at. They are already laughing at us. They laugh, for example, at our petitions; they are laughing at our letters in the press; they are laughing at our telephone complaints; and why shouldn't they laugh at us? They understand perfectly well that this is nothing more than passive resistance, which in reality is no resistance at all. Their fake morality is at war with our true morality.

OBEYING OUR CONSCIENCE


The question that is often asked is: "What should we do?" The answer must be: "As our conscience dictates!" If what feels right to the vast majority is dishonestly depicted as wrong, for example by labelling racial self-preservation as 'racist', then by running away from that word you hand over the world and everything that is in it to our foes. They know, and we must learn to know, what works! This is what they fear more than anything else.

Why do we suffer the humiliation of having our freedom taken away to defend what is ours? Why do we submit to what we do not like? Fear is the answer to both of these questions, and our enemies know it – better than many of us do. Cease to be afraid and they will lose. Should they ultimately win, how much credit should they be given? After all, how much easier is it to destroy than to create and build! The only credit they will deserve if they do ultimately win is that they managed to destroy everything whilst literally not being noticed! Their approach to destroying us, friends, is very simple. "Abandon your very natural and historic moral beliefs and principles or we will find you guilty of one or another offence which we have invented over the last 10 or 20 years. Thus we will

then see published repeatedly in the media which the masses will eventually, superficially at least, accept as the truth, and which will dissuade them from voting for you at election time." Game set and match against those who would fall for these psychological tricks!

CERTAINTY OF EXPOSURE

Of course, our enemies know perfectly well that at some point in the future their plan will be exposed as the consequent decay and chaos resulting from it become ever more apparent impossible to conceal from the masses. Their plan is simply to



The whole network of our public institutions is geared to brainwashing the people, even where matters affecting the health of the very young are concerned. This pamphlet was published by the NHS as a guide to parents. This poison is part of the war against our nationhood. Its prosecutors only get away with it because too many decent people are afraid to oppose them.

“wait until our society has deteriorated beyond a point of recovery. Immigrant birth rates will do the rest.

The task of our enemies is overwhelmingly easier than our own – in the sense that all they have to do is destroy, degrade and belittle whilst we must preserve and build up. Their war is unspoken, subtle, malevolent and cloaked. The war is psychological, and it attempts to reverse our perceptions whereby we are able to distinguish between right and wrong; but it is more destructive than a conventional war, as we are not ‘legally’ able to defend ourselves from the onslaught which necessarily accompanies immigration from the third world – now, as a cover, referred to as asylum-seeking!

White men, the historical defenders of white western European societies and therefore the focus of our enemies, are portrayed in television programmes, for example, as devious, immoral and incompetent, while the coloured man gets the reverse treatment. What could be further removed from the real world in which we live?

WHY DO WE ALLOW IT?

Why do we allow our enemies deliberately to abuse, degrade and cheapen the white race in the media? At the power points of society they exclude real white men. They subtly exclude them, for example, from standing in elections by their recourse to all-women short lists. But none of this is ‘pro-women’. They degrade our womenfolk on television. Very recently I witnessed a ‘parenting’ programme in which young white girls were shown cradling baby dolls of a different race to their own. This is war! War has been declared, and it is time to begin fighting back by exposing our enemies for what it is they are doing to our race and nation. Increasing numbers of men are being deliberately stigmatised with criminal convictions for petty misdemeanours so that the state has an excuse to persecute, exclude and marginalise them from participating in society.

Let me speak plainly. If we lose we will deserve to lose. It is strength and will that win the day. Much as we hate our enemies, they, like us, are fighting from a position of self interest. The demon Blair and his army of harpies, for example, see societal fragmentation and resulting chaos as means of acquiring power for themselves for ever. It is a war, with their shields and guns being symbolised by their creation of their laws, together with an environment of fear and intimidation, all of which have no less an impact upon the human psyche. Their soft sell for increasing controls over us are marketed as ‘safety and security’ measures, which of course are fuelled by their support for policies which deliberately create societal chaos. Muslims want an

Islamic Britain; Blacks, queers and lesbians want what is best for them; and we Whites want to hang on to what is rightfully ours. So who wins in this unspoken war of self interest? The answer is, as it has ever been in the whole of human history, those with the power and might to enforce their will over the rest!

The self-centred craving for power by our political overseers is evidenced quite clearly when one sees that they effectively support and force upon others a system of living which they do not freely choose for themselves. They could not possibly disagree that they have gravitated to their positions upon the basis of their natural abilities in full accordance with the laws of nature. Pulling up the proverbial ladder behind them, so as to deny others the prospect of fulfilling their own true potential, is nothing less than evil, and harms not only those potential high-achievers who are being deliberately dumbed down and cheated but also those who are being artificially elevated to positions to which they are wholly unsuited. Power, not morality, is all these people are interested in, and the Blacks the Browns, and even women, are exploited to help them get it.

These evil people deliberately set out to destroy our education system, for example, by putting unruly and ill-disciplined children into ordered classrooms, in the process destroying the education of the majority. That is why I say that for our people the agenda of our enemies is nothing less than a road to hell.

DECEIT OF THE LEFT

The political left’s deliberate deceit in portraying peoples of different races as equal is neither natural nor scientific and cannot therefore be reasonably or rationally supported by them. Neither God nor Darwin is on their side! Their beliefs cannot therefore be regarded as rooted either in morality or science – which is why hundreds of thousands of white people participate in the phenomenon known as white flight! Why then does the left support it? Simple. They see themselves as the rulers of a society divided along the lines of race and culture, unable to summon the strength needed to bring them down. Divide and rule is their game, and they must be stopped.

Their deliberate degrading of society can be seen everywhere. The replacement of policemen, for example, by community wardens who shall now be called by their first names facilitates the degradation of authority. The drive to bring television into the court rooms; the placing of women in army combat roles; and the discouraging of white male teachers: all can all be linked by a thread of malevolence whose primary purpose is to destroy all that is good and sane about our civilisation. Then there is the deliberate creation of a culture of financial and psychological dependence upon the international moneylenders. There is the invention and use of collectivist jargon such as ‘humanitarian’, ‘world community’ and even ‘world heritage sites’; and this aids the breaking down of the sense of national and regional identity.

Then there is the deliberate expansion of alien creeds and cultures, providing the excuse needed to water down and eventually eradicate our cultural base. Ironical, but true, is the fact that our enemy is only able to succeed because of the co-operation of its white Anglo Saxon/Celtic public sector workforce, who seem only too willing to marshal a system geared to their own children’s destruction! The creatures we are fighting are using the tried and trusted technique of exploiting the greater mass of humanity to bring down the few who are in its way. Now the white race itself is being subjected to this same treatment. In our case the coloured races of Africa and Asia are to be used as pawns in the game, and hastily settled in Western Europe to facilitate the eventual mongrelisation and destruction of our people. Can there be anything more wicked or evil than pretending that you care for a particular group of people for whom in reality you care nothing at all but only wish to exploit for your own ends?

If we do in the very end lose our war it will not be because our instincts failed, or that we could not perceive the dangers before us, but because we failed to act upon those instincts and perceptions. Look into the future, comrades, and imagine being there in the aftermath of our enemies’ victory, wishing you could go back in time! We belong to this land. The bones of our ancestors are buried here. Now is the time to save it!

FRIENDS OF SPEARHEAD

The Friends of *Spearhead* is a support group that has been formed for the purpose of ensuring our magazine’s continued financial survival.

Members of the Friends of *Spearhead* undertake to pay a minimum subscription of £10 a month, in return for which they may, if they wish, receive five copies of each monthly issue for redistribution.

In addition, the Friends of *Spearhead* undertake certain other promotions, details of which are advertised as they occur.

We hope very much that our readers and supporters, not only in the UK but around the world, will rally to help us in this project.

Enquiries to Friends of *Spearhead*, PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT.

Puncturing the Churchill balloon

WINSTON CHURCHILL was the first child of Lord and Lady Randolph Churchill and was born nearly two months prematurely on 30th November 1874 at Blenheim Palace, the Churchill family seat in Oxfordshire. After a whirlwind romance, during which they met only a few times, Lord and Lady Randolph Churchill had been married at the British Embassy in Paris on 15th April 1874.

Apparently, Jennie, Lady Randolph Churchill, had lived in Paris for some time and moved in the highest circles of French society. Jennie (Jeanette) Churchill's mother, is described as being "raven haired" with "striking dark looks," which she inherited from her American Iroquois Indian blood through her mother Clara, referred to in family circles as "Sitting Bull."

According to numerous biographers, throughout her life Jennie was always extremely promiscuous. As Clive Ponting expresses it in his biography *Churchill*, she was "still engaging in numerous affairs." On account of this, it has been suggested that Winston Churchill was not the son of Randolph but of Colonel John Strange, one of Jennie's lovers. However, it could have been one of numerous men, even a Rothschild. If this claim is true, it would make Winston and his descendants impostors and not true descendants of the first Duke of Marlborough and heirs to his titles and estates. This, however, is open to speculation.

Jennie's father was Leonard Jerome, one-time lawyer, elevated to become a newspaper magnate with a principal interest in the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Banker*. Said to have squandered two fortunes, Jerome had an extravagant lifestyle that was a byword in fashionable Fifth Avenue circles. There was bitter acrimony between the then Duke and Jerome over the marriage settlement. It was finally agreed that about £3,600 a year (£300,000 in today's money) would be settled on the newly married couple, £2,500 guaranteed by the Jeromes and the balance furnished by the Duke, who in addition cancelled his son's debts, estimated at £2,000.

Randolph needed all this money to maintain the family's fine house in Curzon Street and an even larger house in Charles Street, with a numerous retinue of servants, grooms, gardeners, cooks, etc., to maintain his unbelievably luxurious and opulent lifestyle. Remember, this was at a time when a labouring man in Britain was lucky if he earned ten shillings a week (£25 a year). Many of the British lived in abject poverty; multitudes of children were overworked, underfed and undernourished, ran about in rags with no shoes on their feet and were deformed by rickets. This was the luxurious lifestyle into which Winston Churchill was born and grew

up.

The Churchills might as well have lived on a different planet. It was said that Winston's father, Randolph, never did a stroke of work in his whole life, and neither did his mother Jennie. Shortly after their marriage, Randolph became infected with syphilis, which finally killed him, although the family managed to keep it a secret for eighty years. With his young wife carrying on with all and sundry, it is really no wonder that Randolph sought sexual satisfaction elsewhere.

CONCEIT "HARD TO EXPRESS"

Perhaps it is no wonder that Winston Churchill grew up to be conceited and arrogant, with a positive hatred of working-class people, whom he viewed throughout his life as dirt. Beatrice Webb, one of the founders of the socialist Fabian Society, once met Churchill over dinner and wrote of him: "Restless, almost intolerably so, without capacity for sustained and unexciting labour, egotistical, bumptious, shallow-minded and reactionary, but with a certain magnetism, great pluck and some originality – not of intellect but of character. Talked exclusively about himself – bound to be unpopular, too unpleasant and flavoured with his restless, self-regarding personality."

The American politician Henry Cabot Lodge wrote to President Roosevelt about Churchill saying: "I have met him several times; he is undoubtedly clever but conceited

to a degree which is hard to express either in words or figures." Ponting, in his biography, wrote: "Churchill came across as overbearing,

RICHARD PORTER provides some facts about the 'great war leader' they'd prefer you not to know

wearing people down by his refusal to stop talking about himself. He did not seem interested in other people or what they thought."

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH

Churchill's father, Lord Randolph, was the second son of the seventh Duke of Marlborough. His ancestor, the first Duke, had risen to fame and fortune during the reign of Queen Anne. Described by one Victorian historian as "notoriously fond of money," he played the decisive role in the overthrow of James II. When William of Orange landed at Torbay on 3rd November 1688, the future Duke of Marlborough, John Churchill, marched against the invader and then coolly turned his army over to him.

His conduct can easily be explained by reference to the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*. This work declares that John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, was paid the then enormous sum of £6,000 a year by Solomon Medina in recognition of his many services. As the Jews' chosen candidate to replace James II on the throne, the Dutchman William of Orange was paid in the form of a 'loan' of two million Dutch guilders by the Jewish merchant, Antonio Lopez Suasso, to take him across the Channel. Although this has been kept out of the history books, it can be seen that Jewish money-changers were the real power behind the scenes controlling events. As pointed out, for valuable services rendered, William allowed the Jews to establish their misnamed 'Bank of England', which effectively gave them control over the country's affairs.

Thus was instituted the National Debt and the conversion of the English into tax and debt slaves. A recent issue of £20 notes confirmed this by printing the six-pointed so-called 'Star of David' on one side, slightly disguised but clearly visible to the discerning mind. In fact, a lie is printed across the top of every bank-note: it should be 'Bank of the Jews'. With the help of their paid lackeys William III and John Churchill, the Jews founded the 'Bank of England' in 1694 and they have controlled it



THE YOUNGER CHURCHILL
A contemporary described him as "egotistical, bumptious, shallow-minded and reactionary."

ever since.

There is no doubt that John Churchill was a very capable general, but he was also extremely perfidious. For his great victories against the French at Blenheim, Ramillies and Malplaquet he was voted an enormous sum of money by Parliament, which enabled him to build the magnificent Blenheim Palace at Woodstock. He was a mercenary who sold himself to the highest bidder. After betraying James II he began to write letters to him declaring that the time would soon come when he could return to England. Arnold Foster, in his book *A History of England*, wrote:-

"For it is certain that on a later occasion he actually went so far as to inform the French of an intended English expedition against Brest, and the information which he gave helped to bring about the defeat of the English and caused the loss of hundreds of English lives. When Marlborough's treachery was discovered, he and his wife were disgraced and dismissed from Court."

So John Churchill betrayed his King and country on several occasions for money when it suited him – even to the extent of causing the deaths of hundreds of his soldiers, the very men who had brought him fame, fortune and glory. The Jews did not pay him £6,000 a year for nothing.

AN INCORRIGIBLE SNOB

In his biography Ponting wrote that when Winston Churchill was in the 4th Hussars as a young man he was accused of forcing out socially unacceptable officers from a lower class who had not enjoyed a pampered and privileged lifestyle like himself. Ponting said that he was involved in the rigging of horse races and illicit gambling and was even accused of homosexuality. He sued the father of the officer who had made the accusation but settled out of court for £500. In a letter to his mother he said that the accusation had to be stamped on quickly or "it would be fatal to any future in public life." According to Commander William Guy Carr, when Churchill visited America his close friend, the shady financier Bernard Baruch laid on red-haired prostitutes for him. Throughout his life Churchill had a valet who literally did everything for him: dress and undress him, tie his shoes, knot his tie, run his bath and dry him afterwards, even tuck him into bed at night. In the early days he travelled everywhere by cab and later by a chauffeur-driven car. He never travelled on a bus in his life. Even his son Randolph had a chauffeur-driven car whilst running up enormous debts. I remember well the shopkeeper in the small grocer's at East Bergholt, where Randolph had a magnificent mansion overlooking the beautiful Dedham Vale, complaining to me bitterly that he never paid his bills. For generations, the Churchills have been nothing more than a bunch of pampered parasites. At present the family are enjoying the millions in 'charity money' paid out to them by the National Lottery for

Winston's wartime papers.

Winston Churchill would spend hours in front of a mirror practising his speeches to perfection, including the gestures and intonation. In his essay 'The Scaffolding of Rhetoric' he said that this was the main weapon and talent of a politician: the hunched shoulders, the lisp, the mispronunciation of certain words like 'nahzi', the V-sign and the cigar: all were carefully cultivated to impress and overawe the people.

A ZIONIST STOOGES

Winston Churchill was always a firm supporter of Zionism and Zionist aspirations, and had little time or sympathy for the Arabs. On 26th January 1949 Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin spoke on the subject in the House of Commons. He said that with half a million Arabs "turned out by the Jewish immigrants into homeless refugees without employment or resources," the tide of Arab Nationalism was "running high and had bitten deep into the ordinary young Arab." Bevin continued: "They consider that for the Arab population, which has been occupying Palestine for more than twenty centuries, to be turned out of their land and homes to make way for another race is a profound injustice," and went on to say that he wondered how the British people would feel if they had been asked to give up a slice of Scotland, Wales or Cornwall to another race.

Now, fifty five years on, it can be clearly seen that this is exactly what the British have done. They have given up vast tracks of their country to the coloured races but, unlike the Arabs, have dumbly accepted it like a flock of compliant sheep. In fact, they give a vote of confidence to the Westminster traitors who have sanctioned the coloured invasion and are taking millions of homes and jobs from the



BERNARD BARUCH

A leading international financier, he was one of Churchill's main mentors. He was thought to have laid on prostitutes for him when he was in America.

British. The British have become a nation of TV zombies, whose thinking is entirely controlled by the sinister gang of financial crooks who control their newspapers and the television screens as well as all the inmates of the Westminster insane asylum.

ADMISSION ABOUT ALLIANCE WITH RUSSIA

By harnessing all of Britain's then immense resources to destroy anti-communist Germany, no one did more than Churchill to help expand the Communist Empire; yet he admitted that if global war came in 1952 or 1953, the Soviet armies could move swiftly to the ocean and subjugate the capitals of Western Europe within six weeks, but at the same time American atomic bombs would at least paralyse communications and oilfields. After all this, Britain, if it still survived, could take a new view of the matter. (*Winston Churchill*: edited by R.A.C. Parker).

NEW WAR PLANNED IN THE FIFTIES

There is every reason to believe that the international bankers, the real world rulers, planned a new world war in the mid-fifties, but the leak of the Rabinovitch speech* put back their plans. The deliberately engineered 'Cold War' was at its height and anti-Soviet feeling was running high in America and elsewhere. Likewise, in Russia the masses had been brainwashed for years with anti-American propaganda. Very few realised at that time that the New York bankers controlled both camps and were setting the scene for a devastating war of their own making. Russia had been given all of America's nuclear secrets and the materials needed to build her first atom bombs, while Britain had given its very latest jet engine, the Rolls Royce Nein, to the Soviets. At the end of World War II, all of the Soviets' fighters and bombers like the MIG15 were based on this engine.

For confirmation of this, consult the Rabinovitch Speech in *Pawns in the Game*, by Commander William Guy Carr; *National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union*, by Professor Anthony Sutton; *Major Jordan's Diaries* (which prove that America "delivered to the Soviets tons of material to build their first atomic bombs."); *Iron Curtain Over America*, by Colonel John Beaty (Intelligence Officer to the White House during World War II); *The Ultimate World Order*, by Major Robert Williams (American Counter-Intelligence Officer); and *The Warlords of Washington*, by Colonel Curtis B. Dall (son-in-law of President Roosevelt).

These books prove beyond any doubt that America has long been under the control of Zionist Jews, exactly the same tribe which even today controls Russia.

* Speech given at a meeting of European Rabbis held in Budapest in the 1950s and translated from the Yiddish by Henry Klein, an anti-Zionist New York lawyer. This is widely circulated by patriotic groups in the USA.

A hotchpotch of fact and fantasy?

LIVING, as we do, in an age when it is fashionable to belittle the achievements of white heroes, it is all too easy to accept Arthurian legend as myth and to query the very existence of an ancient British national leader. The problem begins with the chroniclers, particularly Geoffrey of Monmouth (c1100-1154) who excelled at lacing fact with fiction, and also Sir Thomas Malory whose *Le Morte d'Arthur* (1470) is largely a re-hash of earlier French and English romances. And, although the latter is rightly regarded as a literary masterpiece, it is mostly fable.

In the 19th century Tennyson's epic poems continued that tradition, and in more modern times film-makers have understandably latched on to the superior pulling power of magic and mystery over dull, tedious, authentic fact. In effect therefore we are dealing with two Arthurs whose stories inevitably overlap. We will first look at the charming flights of fancy which have entertained folk of all ages across the civilised world, and then go on to evaluate the evidence pointing to the existence of a real warrior king or chieftain.

The sword in the stone

A lad of fifteen, who has been fostered out and has no knowledge of his royal ancestry, pulls a magic sword from a block of granite, a feat no other aspirant to the throne can manage. Handily, the words "I am hight Escalibore, unto a king fair tresore" are engraved on the hilt, and Arthur is at once proclaimed king. But magic swords do not always last for ever and, according to one tale, in a subsequent fracas Arthur's is split in two.

Luckily, Merlin the magician, who is with him at the time, suggests strolling down to the lake, in the middle of which the King spots an arm in white samite holding "a fair sword" in the hand, which is very quickly presented to him by the legendary *Lady of the Lake*. Years later, after a battle with the treacherous Mordred, Arthur is mortally wounded and instructs his companion Sir Bedivere to take his sword, throw it into a nearby lake, and report what he sees. Doubtless influenced by the presence of several precious stones set in the haft and the pommel, Bedivere twice hides the weapon, each time reporting nothing unusual to be seen as it hits the water. Accused of treachery, he finally does what he is told to do,

KING ARTHUR: MAN OR MYTH?

COLIN VERNON investigates a legend

and sees the sword being grasped by a hand, which shakes it three times, and pulls it beneath the surface of the lake.

A cast of hundreds

While Arthur is always the pivotal figure, the chroniclers' tales are largely concerned with the adventures and exploits of the Knights of the Round Table. (Readers today should under-

counts Queen Guinevere giving her lover a piece of her mind on discovering that he has been playing the fool elsewhere:

*Allas, launcelot du lake
Sithe thou hast alle my hert in wolde
Therlis doughter that thou wold take
Off ascalot, as men me tolde
Now thou leviste for hyr sake
Alle thy dede of armys bolde
I may wofully wepe and wake
In clay tylle I be clongyn colde*

What can we make of it all?

Over the years not everybody has been impressed. Roger Ascham, appointed tutor to Princess Elizabeth in 1548, was a case in point: "In our forefathers' tyme, when Papistrie, as a standing poole, covered and overflowed all *Englande*, fewe bookes were read in our tongue, savyng certaine bookes of chivalrie, as they said for passtime and pleasure; which, as some say, were made in monasteries by idle monks or wanton chanons. As, for example, *Le Morte, d'Arthur*, the whole pleasure of which booke standeth in two speciall poyntes, in open manslaughter and bold bawdrye: in which book they are counted the noblest knights that do kill most men without any quarrel, and commit fowlest adultries by subtlest shiftes: as Sir *Launcelote* with the wife of King *Arthur* his master."

The Norman historian William of Malmesbury was equally scathing regarding the myths, observing: "...this is that Arthur of whom modern Welsh fancy raves. Yet he plainly deserves to be remembered in genuine history rather than in the oblivion of silly fairy tales; for he long preserved his dying country." On the other hand, as mythologist Thomas Bulfinch wrote in 1858, "It is an additional recommendation of our subject that it tends to cherish in our minds the idea of the source from which we sprung." But maybe, before we come down too severely on any ancient folklore, it is worth remembering that when a sufficient number of



One of the many images of Arthur. Whether his deeds are mere fable or not, we could do with his like now, says the writer.

stand that this simple furniture design ensured the semblance, if not the substance, of equality between those seated around it, thus obviating the need for a specially appointed Commission to lay down the rules!). In essence, the tales of Sir Kai, Sir Launcelot, Sir Gawain, etc., etc., are supposed to depict chivalry which is, in very rough order, sorting out wicked knights, rescuing damsels in distress, being nice to everyone, and promoting the Gospel in one's spare time. However, as with the editors of our present day tabloids, the romancers knew that murder, mayhem, mystery, treachery, lust and adultery were the essential ingredients of any good story. A breezily written anonymous metrical romance, possibly 14th century, re-

people are induced into believing that certain fantastic and miraculous reported events actually happened, then we have the makings of a cult, perhaps even a religion. Surely no Anglican minister, Catholic priest, mullah or rabbi would disagree with that!

What really happened?

In his *History of England* G.M Trevelyan notes that for 200 years, beginning late in the 4th century, an important page in our national annals is "a blank, a stretch of great darkness." History is, of course, forever being rewritten, and nothing may be described as incontrovertible fact so long as further evidence lies buried, just waiting to be discovered.

Up to the present day, the buried evidence unearthed suggests that during the later part of the 5th century the pagan invaders (Saxons, etc.) had advanced westwards from Kent to perhaps Portsmouth and northwards towards Somerset. Also occupied were large swathes of Eastern and Central England as far north as Humberside. Remarkably, London and Lincoln had not fallen, and other settlements such as Oxford and Dunstable were effectively isolated in what was still British territory.

During these years the British chieftains, notably Arthur, gradually contained and even reversed the pagans' progress, their efforts culminating in the Battle of Badon (near Bath) c490, where the overstretched Saxon army suffered a heavy defeat. The English, as they are referred to in some histories, were now confined behind recognised frontiers so that, for perhaps twenty

Read *Spearhead* on the Internet!

The best articles and news items published in *Spearhead* in recent months can be seen on the *Spearhead* web-site. You can visit this site at:-

www.spearhead-uk.com



Camlan, in Cornwall, is where the battle took place at which, according to legend, Arthur was killed. The supposed event is commemorated at parades there to this day, as above.

years or so, and for the first time since the Romans departed, an uneasy peace obtained. Arthur died at the battle of Camlan (in Cornwall?) around 515, probably at the hands of his treacherous nephew who was also killed. (see legendary version above).

And what may come

What I believe to be incontestable is that the vast number of monuments/landmarks connected with this King must be taken as indications of his valour and achievements. A modern writer has identified 33 Arthurian sites, beginning in the Scilly Isles and ending in Edinburgh; and, if Brittany in Northern France is included, local tradition once spoke of several hundreds more. It is entirely inconceivable that, in any great measure, these relate solely to the myths surrounding Camelot, however enthralling such tales may be. And those of us who would claim to be Angle, Saxon, Jute or Viking have nevertheless adopted the Celtic(?) Arthur, for better or for worse, as our very own flesh-and-blood national

hero.

And yet it is to legend that I will return for inspiration, and for the comforting knowledge that the King lies sleeping in Avalon awaiting our call for his return. In Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur* we read: "Yet some men say in many parts of England that King Arthur is not dead, but had by the will of Our Lord Jesu into another place; and men say that he shall come again, and he shall win the holy cross. I will not say that it shall be so, but rather I will say: here in this world he changed his life. But many men say that there is written upon his tomb this verse: HIC IACET ARTHURUS, REX QUONDAM REXQUE FUTURUS (*Here lies Arthur, the once and future King*)."

Now that we have an unbelievably large number of wicked knights on the rampage, should not our clergy organise a day, maybe a week, of national prayer begging Arthur to come back as soon as possible. After all, it would seem that he, as distinct from our contemporary royals, would be committed to defending *our* faith!

SORRY AGAIN!

Once more, we must apologise for a bad series of errors on the part of our printers in the production of last month's issue. For some absolutely unaccountable reason, all sub-headings to items where Times Roman script was used came out in medium type instead of bold type, as directed and as set up in our original copy sent on disk to the printers.

SPEARHEAD SUPPORT FUND

Income from the sales of our magazine is not enough to cover full production and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so that we may remain solvent.

Also, because of the controversial nature of the opinions expressed in these columns, it is impossible to induce wholesale distributors to handle the magazine. Hence another reason for our needing additional financial support.

Please send all contributions to *Spearhead*, PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT. Please note that receipts are not normally sent for donations of less than £10 unless specifically requested – in which case an SAE would be appreciated. Thanks.

AT A MEETING in Blackburn, Lancs., on 20th March the decision was made to close down the Spearhead Group – just a year after the group had been formed, then under the name of the Spearhead Support Group. The decision was not announced in exactly this way. In the online bulletin *Nationalist Week* (21st March) it was stated that the SG had simply changed into a new organisation, to be known as the Nationalist Alliance. However, the closing down of the SG was what, effectively, this decision amounted to.

As one who has advertised the Spearhead Group in these pages since its formation in March 2004, and who in the minds of many has been linked with it through the shared nomenclature with this magazine, I owe readers some explanation of what has happened. I shall attempt to give it without resort to rancour or hostility but only as a narration of facts as I have witnessed them.

From the start, the initiative of forming the Spearhead Group did not come from me but from others, mainly based in the North of England, who declared themselves my supporters and the supporters of our magazine. They still declare themselves so, despite the change that has occurred.

They contacted me early in 2004 and suggested the formation of some kind of group to promote the circulation of *Spearhead* magazine. Shortly after this contact had been made, I was in the North of England in the company of Richard Edmonds, and we took advantage of this to meet the people concerned and thrash out a programme and strategy for the group. This meeting took place in a room above a pub in Bradford.

We had in common our shared beliefs in racial nationalism and our concern at developments in the British National Party which were moving the party away from this core philosophy. We shared a total lack of confidence in the current BNP leadership, and we agreed that *Spearhead* was the organ best suited to campaign for needed internal changes in the party, and that more had to be done to increase its circulation.

Our discussions ranged over the means by which these shared objectives could best be achieved.

OPPOSED NEW PARTY

Among the assembled company, Richard Edmonds and I were the ones most adamant that the BNP remained the only practical vehicle for the furtherance of nationalism in Britain, and that all effort should be directed to reforming the BNP rather than being wasted in other political ventures. Most of all, we firmly opposed any suggestions for a new political party. Such ventures had been attempted, up till quite recently, and they had achieved little.

We urged at the same time that those who sought to influence the BNP in the way desired should become members of the party, if they were not so already. One or two replied that they would not be accepted as members even if they tried to join. In the odd case we knew that

they were correct but in one prominent case we could think of no reason why the person in question should not get his membership accepted, since he had done nothing to warrant such a refusal; and we urged him to send his

monthly copies of *Spearhead* that were its standing order, and it was agreed that these be reduced to 25.

Later, when I received messages that the group was having difficulty meeting running

Spearhead Group gone but (it is hoped) not for long

application in. It was just ignored by BNP membership office.

In conclusion to the meeting it was agreed to form the Spearhead Support Group, later shortened to the Spearhead Group. A standing order was placed for 50 copies of *Spearhead* monthly, which the local SSG would be responsible for re-selling. It was agreed that in due course the SSG would hold a series of meetings, these being particularly important in view of the clear policy of the BNP leadership of suppressing free discussion in the party over issues of controversy and 'gagging' speakers

JOHN TYNDALL reports

with dissenting views, particularly myself.

Both Richard Edmonds and I made it clear that neither of us could personally be involved in the running of the group. We had commitments elsewhere, in my case the production and administration of *Spearhead* magazine in particular. We would therefore have to rely on others to run the group, while we would give it all the encouragement and promotion we could and in other ways help it where we could. In effect, therefore, *Spearhead* and the Spearhead Group were to be organisationally separate and independent from one another, though allies.

Apart from the reasons given for this concerning other commitments on our part, there was another. I could not be sure that every statement, article and publication issued by the group would be completely representative of our opinions on all matters. I could see that some things might at times be said on behalf of the group with which we would not wish to be associated. In the course of time this proved to be the case: in more than a few instances I have been forced to explain to irate correspondents that politically irresponsible things said on behalf of the group were not representative of my own views.

I should not need to go into the development of the group over the year that followed, as this has been chronicled in *Spearhead*, with reports of progress and of the main activities. At a meeting in July it was agreed that thenceforward the word 'Support' should be dropped from the organisation's name and that it would be known just as the 'Spearhead Group'.

In due course I was informed that the group could not sustain by sales the cost of the 50

costs I made some modest donations to assist in these, and at the same time volunteered thereafter to supply copies of *Spearhead* at no charge, so that all income from sales could be retained as additional donations.

After some months, at a further meeting which I attended it was proposed that the Spearhead Group begin recruiting people as members. Up to that time people had only been registered as *supporters*, and there was no statutory obligation for them to pay subscriptions as such. I was not terribly keen on this idea but I deferred to the wishes of others present: they had the problems of keeping the group running and meeting the bills; I did not.

Right from the start, my understanding was that the relationship between *Spearhead* magazine under my proprietorship and the Spearhead Group was a relationship of allies, albeit independent of one another, and that therefore there should be constant close consultation in all decisions made affecting the Group. As part of this, I myself registered as a member and paid my £5.00 yearly fee. Eddy Morrison, then chiefly responsible for the day-to-day running of the group, and I were in almost daily telephone contact and would consult over all germane matters. We seemed to have established a good working relationship, and when certain people started sniping at Eddy over the internet (usually anonymously) I provided him with a supportive statement on my own behalf, together with the go-ahead to use it where he felt necessary in his own defence. I had in the past had strong differences with Eddy but this was now, and I felt I owed it to him to be supportive of what he was doing.

As the new year broke, a number of people approached me suggesting it was time that the SG hold a national conference to discuss activities and decisions that would be called for during the year. I agreed, and a meeting was convened near Nottingham on 20th February.

CALL FOR EXTENDED ACTIVITIES

It was very clear from the outset of this meeting that a number of those in attendance were keen to see the range of SG activities extended. I sympathised with them and was willing to discuss how this could be done. Although, as stated, I had no position in the Group and did not make decisions, I could most certainly use my influence to counsel and advise.

However, as the discussion proceeded it was clear that there was a mood in favour of launching a new political party. This I was adamantly against, as was also Richard Edmonds and a few other colleagues of mine of long standing. Some people spoke of a 'time limit' for achieving change in the BNP, beyond which the strategy of working to that end should be abandoned and a rival party launched. We opposed this too, fully realising that there were some present to whom we just were not getting through on this matter.

Whilst we did not by any means have minds closed to ideas for the extension of SG activities, we stated our opinion that there should be no change in the status of the SG itself and that any such extended activities should take place under the name and sponsorship of the SG, not under the name of any new organisation. We could see throughout this discussion that there was a hankering after just such a new organisation and that the moment any such organisation were launched it would look to many like a new political party, if not in immediate fact then in embryo – a halfway house to a new party, so to speak. There was a lively argument as to whether the sought-after extension of activities, into such things as leafleting, demonstrations, etc., could be managed under the name of the SG. I believed it could; others thought otherwise.

STRONG DIFFERENCES

By the end of the meeting it was clear that there were strong differences over these issues. However, very shortly, in early April – a mere six and a half weeks away, I was due to travel north on other business. Since most of those who favoured the setting up of a new organisation were northern-based, we could easily meet while I was in their area and continue the discussion. I suggested that everyone sleep on the matters over which we had disagreed, and then we could reopen them at the time.

Then shortly after the Nottingham meeting an e-mailed circular was sent around by one of these people expressing disappointment at my attitude at that meeting towards the setting up of any organisation not bearing the name of the Spearhead Group and asserting that this must be done. I could see here that we were heading for a clash which would be highly regrettable, and I sent out a circular of my own in reply. In this I stated that I would be prepared to reconsider my position on the new organisation simply out of a desire to avoid conflict. I still was not in favour of it but I tried to show a bit of flexibility on the matter in order to accommodate others. I suggested that the matter could be on the agenda when we next met on the occasion of my visit north in April. In the reaction I received to this I was under the impression that it was agreed upon.

In all these discussions thus far, differences had been aired in a friendly atmosphere. There was nothing that could be described as rowing.

In these discussions I saw the setting up of a new organisation to be something supple-

mentary to, not instead of, the Spearhead Group. In other words, the SG would continue its operations as before, but if some people wanted also to launch a body under which extended activities would be held I would not oppose it, as at first I had done at the Nottingham meeting – the proviso to this always being that it would not be a political party.

At the beginning of March, the SG issued one of its printed bulletins, *Truth*, in which it surveyed the past year of the Group's existence. The message was headed 'One year old: the SG on the move!' It was thoroughly upbeat and reported favourably on how things had been developing. There was no hint in any of this of dissatisfaction. On reading it, I gained the impression that the differences between us were by no means insoluble and that the agreement to keep these matters 'on ice' until we met again in April was solid.

SURPRISE ANNOUNCEMENT

Imagine my surprise when, less than three weeks later, I received *Nationalist Week* announcing that the meeting had been held in Blackburn and that at that meeting it had been decided to change the Spearhead Group into the Nationalist Alliance – meaning, in effect, that the SG was to be discontinued.

I had never been informed of the Blackburn meeting nor of its agenda. I had been under the impression that no moves were to be made in the way of new initiatives until we had met again while I was up north in April. In fact by the time of the Blackburn meeting our April appointment was no more than two and a half weeks away! It had been my intention when we then met to argue again the case against the setting up of any new organisation but not to oppose it if those concerned were really set upon it – again, presuming that the Spearhead Group would keep going.

What I found disturbing about all this was not that there were differences of opinion as to the way forward but that those favouring a different course simply could not wait a very short time for further talks before taking the action they had been calling for. They would have found, had they waited, that the gulf between us was much narrower than it had been at the Nottingham meeting, since I had expressed a preparedness to modify my position in order to attempt some accommodation with them.

It was also disturbing that the Blackburn meeting was called without my even being informed about it. In the report of the meeting and its decision in *Nationalist Week* it was stated that "Messages of support from other groups and parties who could not be in Blackburn yesterday were read out..." From this it must be assumed that such people had been notified about the meeting. However, curiously, I was not! When I questioned this omission I was told that those concerned already knew about my attitude towards the forming of the new body, and there was therefore no need to consult me further on the matter. This was misleading, to say the least,

since I had made it clear in an e-mailed circular to the main activators that I would not oppose such a body if they were really set on it. I could not have made it to Blackburn on 20th March but I would at least have appreciated being informed about the meeting, and I could at least have sent some message to it setting out my views.

On reading about the establishment of the Nationalist Alliance, I e-mailed a selection of the people I knew to be involved and put to them two simple questions. In the first I asked who was to be the leader. That there should be no recognisable leader seemed inconceivable in view of the many declarations these people had made to me of their ideological faith, a faith which had no room for committee rule. However, it turns out that that is precisely the way it is intended the NA shall be run: by committee rule.

The second question concerned the already existent White Nationalist Party, in which some of the founders of the NA had been involved. As there is a White Nationalist Party, I asked, what is the need for a new organisation? The WNP seems to meet the requirements stated as justifying the setting up of the NA, so why not work through the WNP?

And from this proceeds a supplementary question: If the WNP has not come up to original expectations because of certain failings, how is it likely that the NA will turn out to be any different?

Of course, only time will tell.

CONCLUSION


In conclusion to all this, there are three things that should be said:-

Firstly, I very much regret the discontinuation of the Spearhead Group for I believe that it had a very useful function. I am now exploring ways of reconstituting the Group, this time with direct personal involvement on my own part and with control in my own hands.

Next, though I have not been happy about the manner in which all this has been conducted, I shall endeavour to maintain as amicable relations as can be maintained with those involved in the newly formed Nationalist Alliance. The cause of nationalism in Britain has enemies enough already, both external and internal – of whom the latter are by far the more poisonous and dangerous. There is nothing to be gained in making yet more. Notwithstanding the frank speaking employed in this article – which others are welcome to employ in return without resentment on my part – I hope that we will still be able to co-operate in pursuit of common ends.

The last thing than might be said is this. No doubt there will be some in the nationalist camp – and I speak now of the controlling faction in the British National Party – who will be chortling their heads off at this latest development, for in a superficial kind of way it will provide some pleasure to them. However, rather than chortle they would be better advised to reflect soberly on the situation that

Contd. on page 26



SIR: So Michael Howard's Con Party is now proposing the formation of a unified order control service to keep out unwanted immigrants. Should the voters feel reassured? Well, supposing immigrant squatters had invaded your home and were being joined by more and more relatives. Your protests to officialdom are dismissed as 'racist', and your own family's eviction is becoming inevitable. Now, as an election looms, your Tory candidate appears on the doorstep and, in answer to your complaints, promises to put more policemen at the Channel Tunnel. That, in essence, is the Conservative manifesto on immigration. FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON
Louth, Lincs.

SIR: During the recent presentation of the 'Prevention of Terrorism' Bill, Tony Blair declared: "There is no greater civil liberty than to live free from terror attack." Well, if Britain is in danger of any Arab/Muslim terror attacks it is entirely of his Government's own making. The danger is due entirely to its unconditional support for the Zionist Israeli state, with its huge stockpile of some 400 nuclear bombs and its biological and chemical weapons.

America's 'war on terrorism' is no more than a war on the enemies of Israel. The gift of America and Britain to Iraq is daily murder and mayhem. As for the recent elections, they were a total farce. Their aim was to set up a puppet government in Baghdad totally subservient to America (which means to that country's dominant Zionist lobby) and to bring Iraq's oil deposits under American-Zionist control. One and a half million Iraqis have been swept off the face of the earth as a result of British- and American-backed sanctions against their country and the two Gulf Wars. So should we be surprised if some of the Iraqis and their friends want to get back at us? RICHARD PORTER
Needham Market, Suffolk

SIR: Tony Blair and Gordon Brown said last month in Birmingham that they were greatly concerned at the failure of the MG Rover factory. However, it is my opinion that they are really delighted, and I am equally convinced that the same is true of all the leading politicians in our country. My reason for thinking this is simple: the destruction of MG Rover is the outcome of their deliberate policies over many years.

Of course, they are worried that the resulting outrage, particularly in the West

Midlands, may effect them electorally; but at the worst it would never affect them personally – as it has many thousands of car workers.

Today we are no more than tenants in our own land. Our 'democratic' politicians serve foreign masters, including the multi-nationals who profit from the smashing of the British motor industry.

P. LISLE
Southport, Lancs.

SIR: Mr. Bland was quite right to comment on the hypocrisy demonstrated when 376 MPs, mostly 'New Labour' and Liberal Democrat, voted to ban the hunting of foxes with dogs.

Why all this hysteria about hunting while animals suffer extreme cruelty through vivisection, factory farming, the export of live animals, often in horrific conditions, and ritual slaughter?

The answer is that political, financial and religious considerations prevail in these cases, while hunters follow a traditional English pursuit and are consequently hated by those who wish to destroy our country.

Have they considered, or do they really care, that far more foxes are killed on the roads, shot, poisoned or trapped, than are killed by hunting, and that fox deaths by these means will increase because of the hunting ban?

Where were the vehement protests from MPs in the name of animal welfare during the appalling and mishandled foot and mouth crisis, which resulted in the unnecessary slaughter of millions of healthy animals and the ruin of many farmers?

Our overpaid MPs spend much time on useless and often tyrannical legislation, and one reason is because many of our laws emanate from unelected bureaucrats in Brussels.

MARGARET J. BALLARD (Mrs.)
Carshalton, Surrey

SIR: Your article about Britain's ladybirds being under threat from an Asian invader reminded me of two similar stories in recent years. One concerned a proposed cull of goldfish that had been released into our lakes and rivers and were endangering the survival of native species. The other was about a cull of the ruddy duck, the introduction of which was also threatening native stocks.

Strange how some people seem more concerned with the survival of British insects, fish and fowl than they are with the indigenous human population of this country.

S. SINCLAIR
London SE24

SIR: I must challenge Andrew Slade's amazing assertion that the British Communist Party had a very strict rule of never accepting ethnic English members. I was a member of the Young Communist League and then the CP itself from 1947 to 1956 (the 'Great Britain' was dropped after the purported dissolution of the Communist

International during World War II). In the Canterbury branch from 1947 to 1950 all the members were English and (after national service in the RAF) at Oxford from 1952 to 1955 three-quarters of us were. Agreed, Scots and initially Jews were slightly over-represented, but some of the latter slipped away as Stalin launched his ferocious campaign against "rootless cosmopolitans."

I defy Mr. Slade to produce any documentary evidence for his absurd statement. Oh, and in 1880 Lenin was just nine or ten years old – check his biography – and another 41 years were to go before the CPGB was founded in 1921. TONY YOUNG
London E11

SIR: I thought I would just drop you a line to inform you of an interesting experience I have just had. I recently had a holiday in Thailand. There is a large expat community there from Europe. Everyone I spoke to was of the same opinion in their disgust and despair at the way our countries are being invaded by spongers and criminals, courtesy of our respective governments and of the EU.

What was so depressing for me was that the majority of the expats were British. But the French, Belgians, Germans, Dutch, Italians and others all said that the same things were taking place in their own countries. A Belgian told me that 80 per cent of the prison population in Antwerp, a beautiful old European city, is made up of non-Belgians, mainly from Africa, Muslim countries and the Balkans. This is crazy.

M. YOUNG
London SE24

SIR: In commenting on the election broadcasts by the BNP one can only paraphrase T.S. Eliot: "This is the way the election campaign ends, not with a bang but a whimper." Nationalists had every reason to expect that the party's election campaign would be extremely well focused on the scale and consequences of immigration and its precise intentions on this subject. What we got instead was a couple of voice-over sentences from Nick Griffin, two lines of immigration statistics, camera shots of a street sleeper, a guitarist droning a couple of indistinct 'poor me' lyrics, and a scene outside Halifax police station when Griffin declared his intention to speak the truth regardless of consequences. Public reaction was probably summarised well enough by the remark I overheard: "Good guitar-playing... maybe Nick Griffin should take it up." Among rank-and-file nationalists the effect could only be described as embarrassing. The BNP is supposed to be the British people's last chance of rescuing the country via the electoral process, not a branch of the drop-out protest song industry. The party's election results might still improve, but if they do it will be in spite of, not because of, these pathetic broadcasts. FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON
Louth, Lincs.

The prophet

The following transcription of a radio broadcast has been censored to comply with the oppressive and anti-democratic laws in force in our British land today:

"Well, realise it and realise it well you English. You in your own country, you are the heirs of great people who have built up a marvellous Empire. If there is any pushing to do, let's start and do it ourselves. You have the right to say and do what you think, to act as you like, and if a Russian, or an American, or a --- does not like it, you are at home in your own country, and you have the right to take him by the seat of his pants and show him that the spirit of England is not quite dead yet. Neither I nor Churchill can represent England, only what you do and how you act can be the determining factor to decide whether, betrayed, we intend to react and take our place in the lines of civilisation, or whether we are a race played out who accept foreign interference, foreign control, and who go forward to the loss of all we possess, because we have neither the courage nor the desire to preserve our heritage."
(John Amery, speaking from Berlin 1942)

As with so many of his contemporaries Mr. Amery conveys the impression that only England, rather than the United Kingdom, was involved in the ill-conceived and ultimately disastrous war against Germany in 1939. Otherwise we find his analysis of our situation faultless. And every day our nation pays the price for ignoring sound advice. Please read on!

The return of the scourge...

"The situation has reached epidemic proportions. We are now witnessing a spiralling rise in sexually transmitted diseases. An anticipated 50 per-cent increase in the infection rate could overwhelm Britain's sexual health services." So says a recent report. We are, it seems, never short of expensive reports but when it comes to action little is seen to be done. Chlamydia and gonorrhoea infections are

THE WAY WE LIVE NOW

Some observations on contemporary society

by JUNIUS

up by 193 per cent and 137 per cent respectively over the past decade. And now, unbelievably, the old enemy syphilis is making a frightening comeback, with reported cases fourteenfold what they were ten years ago. However, no information is available as to who brought it back in and where from! Mere statistics? Or the life blood of a nation draining away? We are running out of time. Britain awake!

... and the logic we must not use

It will readily be noticed that all our problems are craftily compartmentalised, and that very rarely do either ministers or media draw public attention to the obvious links between the various sorrows that beset the nation. Put another way, the very concept of 'cause and effect' has become politically incorrect and is to be avoided wherever possible. Regarding the above-mentioned horrific increase in sexually transmitted diseases, little effort is made to link promiscuity with those shady, disreputable, often alien-controlled, establishments where lethal substances and unlimited alcohol are freely available, or with those schoolteachers and parents who have opted for the easy way out, which is to say nothing and do nothing. The probability that drugs, uncontrolled immigration, and the depraved hysteria-inducing racket masquerading as music play a significant part in this thoroughly un-British scene must not be mentioned. And yet those links are there for all to see, even though the well sheltered inhabitants of the 'Westminster Village' predictably ignore them. However, if our folk, in total desperation, were to take matters into their own hands, then we would very soon hear howls of distress coupled with the cry of "vigilantes." But, in

the absence of dedicated and effective policing, what alternative do they have?

No-one is safe...

"Every day someone is dying from a knife and nothing is being done about it. Tomorrow, next week, next year, somebody else could be in my shoes, because it is out of control. My son died just ten months after one of his best friends was stabbed to death on Fulham Broadway." A bereaved London mum.

And then there is old Nell in Birmingham, who is 78. Her husband died three years ago and she lives in a one-bedroom flat on her own. Since Harold died, drug-crazed addicts have burgled her home twice, and three times she has been attacked on the way home from the post office where she draws her miserable pension; miserable because much of what should be hers has been criminally given away elsewhere. A toffee-nosed woman journalist without a jot of experience of the seamier side of inner-city life asks her: "What's the most important issue in your area?" To which she replies: "Send the darkies back home." At this point we would stress that old Nell does not have a 'racist' (if readers will pardon the use of this silly adjective) thought in her head. Surely, she hates. She hates those who have brought Britain to this sorry pass, and she remembers how things once were; she prefers how things once were and, if she had a choice, she would have things back as they were. She has been betrayed and she is powerless. The pretty 18-year-old, who cheered the boys returning from a war allegedly fought to free the world from Hitler's storm-troopers, could never have known that her old age would be a living nightmare.

Meanwhile there are, on

average, 29 shootings a day in Britain. The good news is that this statistic largely comprises gangsters shooting one another.

... and class warfare is still going strong

'Divide and rule' is as old as the hills, and it is still going strong today. Another columnist, writing for the same intellectually bankrupt 'quality' newspaper, explains that, as you go down through the social divisions – that is to say the closer you get to the cutting edge of multi-racialism – the more likely you are to think that Britain should close the door to immigrants, and that it is asylum-seekers who are overburdening our public services. Old Nell (previously mentioned) is clearly a D, or even an E, that is to say a member of one of those social classes where the unscrupulous leader of the Opposition is said to be gaining support with his hastily concocted and utterly deceitful proposals on immigration and gypsies. Quaintly, the writer of this article observes that: "Sadly for Michael Howard, though, the more he gets the dogs slaving, the more the rest of us are repelled."

And it is there that you can see Britain's problem in a nutshell. Not only are we classified socially – in our view it should be upwards from A to E – we are also required to ignore our feelings, our perceptions and our preferences, to espouse political correctness or be sternly reprimanded, if not worse. However, as many pet-owners will have discovered, it is often the dog that gets it right!

Just what we need!

Even if we tend generally to dwell on our miseries which, as it is sometimes said, are legion, this column often tries to round up the month with some passably entertaining folly. Recently a large banner draped across railings in our high street advertised a nearly new sale in aid of the *National Childbirth Trust*. Looking back over the past, it now seems unbelievable that society has managed for aeons to survive without the support and assistance of such commendable organisations. Maybe we should write off to the Hon. Sec. to enquire whether they publish an instruction manual!

SPEARHEAD BOOKS

PO Box 2471, Hove,
East Sussex BN3 4DT

Advance to Barbarism (F.J.P. Veale) £13.95.

Shows how warfare has degenerated to some of the worst levels in known history.

Alien (The General League of Anti-Communist Associations, 1933) £7.00.

The true story of the alien domination of Weimar Germany, 1919-1932. Introduction by Dr. E.R. Fields.

Anglo-Saxon Riddles (John Porter) £4.95.

Ingenious characters who speak their names in riddles. A sparkling translation retaining all the original vigour and subtlety.

Assassination: The Tragedy of South Africa (Jaap A. Marais) £6.00.

This book charts the events which led up to and followed the political murder of Dr. Verwoerd and the relentless reversion back to savagery, poverty and horror which all thinking people knew would follow. The author does, however, give a glimpse of hope for the future.

Atrocities: The Moral Question (Sir Oswald Mosley) £4.50.


How Europe is poisoned by hypocrisy and one-sided allegations.

Behind the Lodge Door (Paul A. Fisher) £16.75.

About the influence of Masonic secret societies on church and state.

Best Democracy Money Can Buy, The (Greg Palast) £9.95.

An investigative reporter exposes the truth about globalisation, corporate confidence tricks and high-finance fraudsters.



Bitter Harvest (Ian Smith) £20.00.

About the great betrayal and the dreadful aftermath of 'independence' in Rhodesia by Africa's most controversial leader.

Brazil: A Study in Racial Integration and National Weakness (Seth Adamson) £2.75.

How a nation with every natural resource failed to develop and remained in the Third World.

Break His Bones (Bradley R. Smith) £12.99.

Reveals the systematic attempts at the suppression of historical revisionism in the USA.

British Peace and How to Get it, The (Sir Oswald Mosley) £4.00.

A proposal for a negotiated peace in 1940 with Empire intact and people safe.

Camp of the Saints, The (Jean Raspail) £12.00.

A work of fiction that has almost come true: the overwhelming and destruction of Europe by immigrants from the Third World.

Churchill's War, Vol. II (David Irving) £25.00.

The history of the middle and later years of World War II.

Codreanu and the Iron Guard (Keith Thompson) £3.90.

The inspiring and tragic story of Rumania's nationalist movement.

Corrupted Art and Jazz Music (John Rozmital and Henry Ford Snr.) £3.30.

A concise explanation of how the distortion of European culture came about by fraud and financial control of key sectors of the art world.

Crucifying the Saviour of France (Harry Elmer Barnes) £3.90.

The trial and imprisonment of Marshall Pétain and the circumstances that led to

The prices given here include postal charges for dispatch within the British Isles. For postage overseas please enquire before ordering.

Payments should be made to 'Spearhead Books' and sent to the above address.

Spearhead Books handles works by numerous and varied independent authors. It should not need stating that the publisher of Spearhead may not necessarily endorse all the contents of these works.

his fate.

Czechoslovakia: the Naked Truth About the World War Plot (G. Lane Fox Pitt-Rivers) £3.90.

This little booklet really shows the the pre-war situation accurately, and gives a fresh look at the policy of so-called 'appeasement'.

Deculturalisation of the English People (John Lovejoy) £5.95.

The sad story of the process by which the English people are in essence being destroyed, and a remedy to reverse the situation.

Did Six Million Really Die? (Richard Harwood) £5.00.

Controversial and yet good news for all alleged victims and students of the 'Holocaust'.

Dissecting the Holocaust (Germar Rudolf) £20.00.

In 22 contributions, each of 30 pages, 17 authors dissect the generally accepted paradigm of the 'Holocaust'. One by one, the lies, forgeries and deceptions by politicians, historians and scientists are exposed and disposed of for ever.

Do we Need Mass Immigration? (Anthony Browne) £6.00.

All the reasons why immigration by the teeming masses of the Third World is bad for Britain.

Enemies of the Queen (Dr. Kitty Little Ph.D.) £3.90.

Written from the author's personal knowledge and experiences of the enemy within.

Enemy of Europe (Francis Parker Yockey & Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £10.75.

Given here is the view of the 'European Situation' by the man who was hailed by many people as America's greatest post-war philosopher. Comment and analyses by Prof. Revilo P. Oliver, who has written many incisive works on current racial and social problems.

English Heroic Legends (Kathleen Herbert) £9.95.

The authoress's encyclopaedic knowledge of the period is reflected in the wealth of detail she brings to these tales of adventure, passion, bloodshed and magic.

Evil Good Men Do, The (Jeffrey Hamm) £10.00.

About decisions by governments that have led to the ruin of Britain.

Exactitude (Robert H. Countess, Dr. C. Lindtner and Germar Rudolf) £10.00.

Eight of the world's leading revisionist historians have here contributed essays concerning their research and discoveries. The book commemorates Dr. Robert Faurisson's 75th birthday.

Facts About the Bank of England (A.N. Field) £4.50.

First published in 1938, this book is an excellent primer for all those with an interest in finance and the way it works

Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds, The (Prof. Robert S. Griffin, Ph.D.) £20.00.

The biography of the late Dr. William Pierce, who was the founder of the National Alliance in the USA. In this work the reader embarks upon a journey throughout the

American patriotic movement with details of all the main personalities, ideas and issues involved.

Fatima and the Great Conspiracy (Deirdre Manifold) £10.75.

An attempt to explain the meaning and truth behind the vision.

Fiend and Felon (Gerd Honsik) £10.50.

The author shows the unsavoury side of the character of Simon Wiesenthal, the notorious 'nazi-hunter'.

Fighting Programme of the Social Credit Party (Social Credit Head Office) £3.90.

An interesting and informative booklet by Britain's best known monetary reform organisation. It was first printed over 60 years ago.

Final Judgement (Michael Collins Piper) £20.00.

A best-seller from the USA. Piper makes a convincing case to prove that the Mossad, the feared Israeli intelligence service, was involved in the assassination of J.F. Kennedy.

Flash Point (Ingrid Weckert) £15.95.

The aftermath of 'Kristallnacht', 1938, had far-reaching consequences which in turn contributed to the Second World War. This book looks at instigators, victims and beneficiaries. Some of the conclusions shatter the orthodox view of contemporary history.



French Revolution, The (Nesta Webster) £19.00.

An excellent historical account, with descriptions of the horrors that set the scene for the more terrible events of the communist revolts in other parts of the world.

General Patton's Warning (Author unknown) £3.30.

A glimpse into the mind of 'Old Blood and Guts', as he was known by his men. Also the likely contents of his 'little black book, with which he threatened to expose the cruel treatment of German civilians when the war was over.

Hall of Mirrors (David Sinclair) £18.99.

About the Treaty of Versailles and the injustices within it that made the Second World War inevitable.

History and Biology (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £1.30.

Traces the history of mankind and its eventual fate if some form of eugenics is not brought into population management.

Hoax of the 20th Century, The (Prof. A.R. Butz) £15.00.

The most famous, and indeed seminal, work, on 'Holocaust' revisionism.

Horus Saves (E.A. McCallum) £5.80.

An historical novel illustrating conquests of nations by religion.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain (Author unknown) £3.30.

Chamberlain's life, his ideas and his legacy. Chamberlain's famous book *Foundations of the 19th Century* was important in showing the relationship between race and civilisation.

How Can Liberals be so Stupid? (George Lincoln Rockwell) £3.30.

A brilliant explanation of what motivates silly and woolly-minded people in contemporary society, and how to deal with them.

How it was Done (Steven Smith) £5.00.

The inspiring story of the rise of Burnley BNP from almost nothing to national renown. The secret of the branch's dramatic electoral success and many

other tips on how to build a local organisation, from the man who pioneered this outstanding achievement. 75pp.

Innocent at Dachau (Joseph Halow) £16.95. An eye-witness account by a court reporter.

Is This Justice? (The Duke of Bedford) £5.60. An account of the workings of Defence Regulation 18B during World War II, with many examples of gross injustice brought about by imprisoning men and women without charge or trial.

Islam and the Reich (Atualla Bogdan Kopanski, PhD.) £3.50. A fascinating account of how many Muslims volunteered to enlist in the German forces in World War II.

José Antonio and the Spanish Falange (Rev. James K. Warner) £3.30. The inspiring story about the short life and bloody death of one of Europe's most original thinkers.

King Arthur's Place in Pre-History (W.A. Cummins) £10.95. A legend traced back to the Bronze Age, possibly linked to Stonehenge and the early Wessex culture.

Land for 'The Chosen People' Racket, The (Major C.H. Douglas) £7.50. How land is filched from the people by banks and government.

Land and the People (Jorian Jenks) £3.30. One of the founders of the Soil Association sets out his ideas for the revitalisation of Britain's agriculture. A pre-war Blackshirt publication.

Land Rights and Birth Rights (Peter B. English) £12.00. Exposes a great Australian hoax. An examination of the rights to ownership of former Aboriginal land.

Leon Degrelle and the Rexist Party, 1935-40 (Dr. E.R. Fields) £2.75. The fascinating story of the life of one of the most awe-inspiring men in Belgian and European history.

Liar's Ought to Have Good Memories (Alexander Baron) £4.95. An accurate exposure of the workings of the communist Jewish lie factory otherwise known as *Searchlight* magazine.

Lindbergh's Fight for America (Jim Peron) £2.10. The activities of this famous aviator campaigning for peace during the pre-war period are revealed.

Mosley's Men in Black (John Millican) £30.00. This hard-cover book, which contains many illustrations in full colour, gives details of the flags, insignia, uniforms and badges of the pre-war BUF. In addition, there are many fine portraits of the leading personalities.

My Awakening (David Duke) £24.00. One of the finest books to deal with issues which are of concern to white people everywhere.

Nameless War, The (Capt. A.H.M. Ramsay) £11.00. A nationalist classic. The struggle for the soul of Europe and the White Race. About the hidden forces behind World War II and the identity of the real victors.

Origins of the Second World War, The (A.J.P. Taylor) £9.75. The classic work by this most respected historian, which began the trend towards revising many previously held views on the causes of World War II.

Other Concentration Camps (Jeffrey Hamm) £2.50. Born in South Wales and arrested in

the Falkland Islands in 1940, the author was interned without charge or trial. This is his story.

Out of Step (Arnold Leese) £3.95. The life story of one of Britain's foremost experts on the Jewish Question.

Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion in Context, The (Kerry Bolton) £12.50. A study of this amazing document from both a historical and contemporary viewpoint.

Race Books (H.B. Isherwood) £4.00. Four books entitled *Man's Racial Nature*; *Race and Kinship*; *Race and Politics* and *Religion and the Racial Controversy*.

Race Warriors (Russell Lewis) £11.95. About the perverse results of anti-racism.

Radio Priest and the Union for Social Justice, The (Father Charles E. Coughlin) £3.90. This book contains a 20-page transcript of a broadcast made by the 'Radio League of the Little Flower'. Father Coughlin, the most popular churchman of his generation in the USA, here defends himself against a vicious attack by General Hugh Johnson.

Rebuilding Russia (Alexander Solzenitsyn) £8.00. Reflections and proposals from this talented and extraordinary man.

Rising Tide of Colour, The (Lothrop Stoddard) £10.00. The growing demographic threat to white survival. A very relevant warning to the present generation.

Second World War in Photographs, The (Imperial War Museum) £21.95. A large-format book by world-famous photographers.

Secret Societies and Subversive Movements (Nesta Webster) £17.95. Argues the case for suspecting a secret directing influence behind most major political convulsions.

Selections From BUF Quarterly (Ed. Dr. E.R. Fields) £10.00. A fascinating collection of writings published circa 1935-40 by such personalities as Anne Brock Griggs, Ezra Pound, Roy Campbell, Wyndham Lewis, A.K. Chesterton, Prof A.P. Laurie and others.

Settlers in Eastern and Central Africa (Capt. Kenneth McKilliam) £3.90. A first-hand view by a colonial education officer of how white rule was undermined by British politicians, to the detriment of the native Africans.

Silver Saga, A (Fiona A. Philpott) £8.95.

Beautifully illustrated in colour, this book is a study of the arts and crafts of the Vikings. It concentrates upon the Viking treasures found in the North and West of Britain.

Stalin's War of Extermination 1941-45. (Joachim Hoffman) £30.00. This book details the German Army's desperate attempt to frustrate Soviet plans to subjugate Europe.

State Secrets (Count Leon de Poncins) £16.95. A study of 20th Century power politics and the 'behind-the-scenes' influences that shape the course of events.

Stranger than Fiction (Anon.) £6.00. An amazing and detailed report of the 'hidden hand' behind the destruction of the World Trade Centre. Convincing and authenticated revelations and research.

Talmud Unmasked, The (Rev. I.B. Pranaitis) £11.00. This much talked-of Jewish book

researched and translated as a useful tool in the understanding of modern Jewish aspirations.

They Dare to Speak Out (Paul Findley) £16.95. Many examples of how the Israeli lobby in the USA ruins politicians, academics and patriotic citizens who dare even to ask for debate on the Palestine Question.

Thug or a Million Murders (Col. James L. Sleeman) £12.50. The devotees of the cult of 'Thuggee' in India were murderers who believed they had the protection of the goddess Kali. The writer's grandfather was principally responsible for eliminating the cult, and this book relates the story of his endeavours.

Tomb of English People, The (Duncan Balmer) £8.70. This new book gives a concise history of England and contemptuously spurns political correctness. As the author points out, the graves of our ancestors may be found all over the earth, but our influence remains.

Traditionalist's Anthology (Elizabeth Freeman) £6.00. The editor's choice is a key to a collection of gems so excellent in themselves that they "Make hungry where most (they) satisfy."

Warburg and the Kalergi Plan (Capt. A. Rogers OBE) £3.90. World Government through European Union and racial mixing have long been the dream of the powerful forces that control governments. Here this once senior officer in British military intelligence gives the result of his diligent research.

We Accuse: Debora Lipstadt, Professor of 'Chutzpah' (K.R. Bolton) £3.30. A critique and analysis of Lipstadt's book *Denying The Holocaust*. This booklet exposes the many tricks that are used to smear researchers into the real operation and purpose of the concentration camps.

Which Way Western Man? (William Gayley Simpson) £28.00. The stark facts of extinction and slavery or resurgence and rebirth for the white race are laid before the reader. Will we be hated forever by our descendants or can we rise to the greatest challenge that any generation has ever had to face? The writer covers all.

White Fang/Call of the Wild (Jack London) £5.50. London's much acclaimed works which explore the kingdom of the wolf.




White Power (George Lincoln Rockwell) £15.25. One of those books never to be forgotten. The ship of state, the friends of the captain and the disaster!

Why Civilisations Self-Destruct (Elmer Pendell) £10.30. An examination of the reasons why societies die out, with examples from ancient to modern times.

Witness to History (Michael Walsh) £6.00. There are probably more facts and quotes regarding the Third Reich in this A4 magazine-size book than in any other publication.

World Revolution (Nesta Webster) £18.95. A detailed history of communist movements in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Zionist Factor, The (Ivor Benson) £13.95. Developments in the Middle East which threaten to draw all mankind into the catastrophe of another world war make it more urgently necessary than ever before to explore Zionism as one of the major forces shaping our world.



Ruislip meeting

An all-nationalist meeting was held in Ruislip, Middlesex on April 17th. About 30-35 were in attendance to hear speeches by Tess Culnane (seen speaking on right), Peter Rushton and John Tyndall. Ian Edward (seated in picture) was in the chair.



SPEARHEAD GROUP GONE BUT (IT IS HOPED) NOT FOR LONG

(Contd. from page 21)

has led to all this. If things were as they should be, nationalists in Britain would be all united together in common effort under the banner of the BNP. The tragedy is that they are not, and that there is a growing number of nationalists in the country who want nothing whatever to do with the BNP as it presently stands. This is no cause for self-congratulation in the BNP camp. Rather, there should be a great deal of soul-searching over what has gone so badly wrong.

It remains my conviction that the BNP, suitably reformed, provides the best – indeed the only – way forward and that those who desire that reform should stay in the party, or at least not oppose it; and I have given the reasons for this in some detail in an article in these pages last month.

I deeply regret that others do not see things the same way. This said, though I disagree with them I can understand them.

LEGAL FUND: £2,400 RAISED

Contributions to our Legal Fund over the past month have raised the total to £2,400.00. Naturally, as with all such funds, donations taper off a bit after the period following the initial launch. However, readers will not need telling that a good deal more needs to be raised.

As readers will know, the fund has had to be opened to finance a civil action in the High Court against British National Party Chairman Nick Griffin for authorising the expulsion of our editor, John Tyndall, from the party. This happened a short time after Mr. Tyndall had announced his intention to make a constitutional challenge to Mr. Griffin for the party leadership.

All contributions should be marked 'Legal Fund' and sent to PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT.

For new insights into the nationalist faith, read...

HERITAGE AND DESTINY

20 pages of quality articles of British and world interest.

Published quarterly to bi-monthly

£2.00 per copy (US or Canada \$3.00). Subscription for six issues: £18.00 (US or Canada \$24.00)

Obtainable from PO Box 331, Blackburn, Lancs BB1 2WU
(US address: PO Box 812, Ashburn, VA 20146-0812, U.S.A.)

The Eleventh Hour

The Eleventh Hour has sometimes been described as the 'Bible' of British Nationalism. First published in 1988, it was updated in the 1998 edition to take in the many developments occurring on the political scene in the intervening years. Written by the founder of the British National Party, John Tyndall, the book gives comprehensive coverage of all the major current issues affecting Britain. It delves into the ideologies of liberalism, conservatism and the left, and also examines that of British Nationalism and its background. It contains an extensive analysis of the British economy and political system. It looks at issues connected with freedom and order, the mass media, the environment, race and immigration, Northern Ireland, the Commonwealth, foreign policy and defence. It also gives a detailed outline of the development of the BNP and its predecessor organisations in Britain.

The Eleventh Hour runs to 537 pages. It is partly autobiographical, giving an account of the author's origins, early political awakening and subsequent life's work.

Price: hardback £25.00 plus £4.78 p&p; softback £17.50 plus £3.75 p&p.
Please make out cheques to Albion Press and send orders to PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT.

How to obtain *Spearhead*

Make sure of your regular copy of *Spearhead* by becoming a subscriber. Please fill in the form here and send it to us, together with payment, as directed. Please note also the rates for bulk-buyers.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ENCLOSED SUBSCRIPTION OF.....

PLUS DONATION (IF ANY) OF.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick box where applicable):-

British Isles £24.00 ☐; Overseas surface mail £27.50 ☐; Air mail Europe £30.00 ☐; Air mail elsewhere £38.00 ☐.


PLEASE NOTE: These rates apply if your remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If the remittance is in any other currency, an additional charge of £5.50 must be made in the case of cheques and money orders and £3.00 in the case of banknotes, these paying for our bank's commission and charges.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:-

10-19 copies £1.10 each; 20-49 copies £1.00 each; 50-99 copies 83p each; 100-199 copies 69p each; 200-499 copies 60p each; 500 copies or over 55p each. For advice on postal rates for these quantities please contact our office.

All cheques and postal or money orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT. Please do not include payment for *Spearhead* in a remittance which includes payment for other items.

JOHN TYNDALL



The book you must read if you want to know what John Tyndall stands for

BNP men on 'race hatred' charges

BIG DEMO IN SUPPORT OF 'THOUGHT CRIMINALS' AT HALIFAX



ABOUT 300 British National Party members and supporters turned up to demonstrate outside the police station in Halifax, Yorkshire on April 6th in support of party members due to answer bail, having been arrested in December in connection with alleged offences under the Public Order Act 1986. They were supposed to have "used threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour intending thereby to stir up racial hatred" or "whereby racial hatred was likely to be stirred up."

The demonstration had been called by BNP headquarters in support of party chairman Nick Griffin and former Young BNP leader Mark Collett, who had been arrested as a result of a huge investigative operation centred in West Yorkshire following the showing of the TV documentary *Secret Agent*, made by a BBC reporter, Jason Gwynne. Gwynne had surreptitiously smuggled recording

A cross-section of the big crowd assembling at Halifax Police Station in support of the BNP men.

equipment into party meetings in the county and in Lancashire while posing as a BNP supporter. Parts of speeches by the two were cited as possible grounds for 'racial hatred' charges – although they had been made to closed meetings attended only by those known or believed to be party supporters.

Also arrested in December in connection with the same investigation was *Spearhead* editor John Tyndall, whom Gwynne had secretly filmed speaking at a meeting in Burnley, Lancs., in March 2004 – again the subject of alleged 'racial hatred' violations. Mr. Tyndall was ordered to appear with the other two at Halifax last month.


On arriving, all three were informed that they were being charged with the alleged offences. They were released on

bail and directed to appear at Leeds Magistrates' Court the following day. There they were given further bail and ordered to present themselves at the same court again on May 19th, when it is believed that a *prima facie* case by the Crown against them will be presented. If this happens, it is likely that they will be made to appear for trial at Leeds Crown Court later in the year.

The BNP will be organising a demonstration at the court on May 19th in support of Messrs. Griffin and Collett. A similar demonstration in support of Mr. Tyndall is being organised by the Nationalist Alliance – for which he is grateful, while not being a member of the NA and having made it clear that his first and sole loyalty is to the BNP.

Watch out for further reports.

Now available to *Spearhead* readers, DVD highlights of the 2004 New Orleans EURO conference, including John Tyndall's speech and David Duke's keynote address



I hope every reader of *Spearhead* will see the recently released DVD of the International European-American Unity and Leadership Conference – held in **New Orleans, Louisiana, in May 2004**. It was the most important and exciting Nationalist conference I have ever attended. It welcomed home David Duke, the most politically incorrect, yet charismatic figure in American politics, and it brought together for the first time the most important groups fighting for our heritage and freedoms. Courageous and eloquent leaders from America, Canada and Britain came together with a new sense of unity and purpose.


In addition to David Duke, perhaps the most straight speaking political figure in America, we had Kevin Strom of the National Alliance, Don Black – creator of Stormfront, the largest Nationalist website in the world, anti-immigration and free-speech leader Paul Fromm, **former BNP chairman and editor of *Spearhead* magazine John Tyndall**, Historian and publisher Germar Rudolf, Attorney-activists Sam Dickson and Edgar Steele, columnist Bob Whittaker, Dr. Edward Fields editor of *The Truth At Last* and many others.

The three DVD's have 400 minutes of incredible talks on the critical issues facing America such as the illegal alien invasion, the disastrous Zionist influence upon the American media and government, and the catastrophe America faces in this Israeli-orchestrated Iraq War. You can have the full color, exciting DVDs of this dynamic event and you will get hours of truth and inspiration. It makes a great gift for you and your family and perfect for those who you want to awaken! – **James Kelso**

Vol 1 – Highlights of the opening address by David Duke plus cameos of speakers and highlights of speeches of Sam Dickson, Dr. Edward Fields and Kevin Strom. Also an excellent Q & A with Duke and Strom.

Vol 2 – Highlights of John Tyndall, Bob Whitaker, Germar Rudolf, Paul Fromm, and David Duke's keynote address.

Vol 3 – Highlights of Don Black, Willis Carto, Roy Armstrong, Edgar Steele, David Pringle, Howie Farrell, Kenny Knight, James Edwards, Michael Polignano, panel with Duke, Strom, Dickson, Fromm and Black. Closing speech by David Duke.



US and Canadian readers can order either DVDs or VHS Videos (**\$19.95 each, or all three for only \$50.00 – post paid**) of the conference direct from **The David Duke Report**, PO Box 188, Mandeville, LA 70470. Checks/Money orders should be made payable to *Duke Report*. You can also order by credit card and/or online at – www.davidduke.com

UK (and other non-American) readers can order DVD's ONLY (**£12.00 each or all three for only £30.00 – postage free**) from *Heritage and Destiny*, PO Box 331, Blackburn, BB1 2WU. Cheques/Postal Orders should be made payable to 'Heritage and Destiny'. Sorry no credit card orders.

Heritage and Destiny also sell a number of White Nationalist, Loyalist and England enamel pin badges. Please send a SAE for a copy of our latest catalogue, or check out our website at www.efp.org.uk. Send to *Heritage and Destiny*, PO Box 331, Blackburn, BB1 2WU, England.